



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BIBLICAL LITERATURE

I. THE FUNDAMENTAL FACTORS.

RELIGION, History, and Archaeology, not only of the Israelites, but also of the nations to whom the latter were either related or with whom they came in close contact, are the essential factors of Biblical studies. No results obtained by a purely literary text-critical method can be accepted which do not stand the test of these factors. The fundamental importance of this statement is so manifest as to constitute it a truism. The Mosaic Books that present a mixture of religion, history, and archaeology must of course be viewed in the same way. However, though essential to Biblical studies and generally considered in the treatment of these subjects, the modern critics do not look upon them as fundamental to the extent of modifying the results arrived at by an analytical and critical study of the Old Testament. On the basis of these results, more or less probable, an artificial edifice of the religion, history, and archaeology of the Israelites has been erected. Its presentation on lines, which almost entirely ignores the Oriental mode of thought and expression, is at best highly ingenious and attractive. But we might as well present Moses and the Biblical writers in modern garb as to view their writings in the light of modern thought. Believing in the accuracy and precision of their own presentation, the modern critics make it a norm for the study of the religion, history, and archaeology of other Semitic peoples. The conclusions obtained from these studies cannot but confirm their own views, since they merely reflect their own preconceived ideas. We may illustrate this procedure with the words of Johns in his book (17): 'Now when one fancies he can discern a surprising likeness between some clause in the Code of Hammurabi and some verse in the Bible, he is wise to keep his surprise to himself until he has

procured and studied the latest critical subdivision of the laws of Israel and satisfied himself to which source or sources his verse belongs. Then one has to ransack other authorities to know whether this ruling is one which is widely accepted, and even more important, whether it had been independently reached or was constructed with an eye to the very likeness to Babylonian law which it dreaded to acknowledge.' Notwithstanding the gigantic labours of master minds for over a century, which might have been employed for more useful and more noble aims than of discrediting the Old Testament accounts of Israel's history and religion and thereby undermining the fundamentals of the prevailing creeds, it does not require great ingenuity and learning to point out the defects and to demonstrate the artificial character of their construction of the religion and history of Israel. We may illustrate it by one of the most important views which forms the starting-point of modern criticism.

The modern critics arbitrarily deny the historical character of the patriarchs of Israel and consider the history concerning their existence legends pure and simple. Consequently, the syncretism discernible in the laws and religious conceptions of Israel must date from a post-Mosaic period. There is no need to dwell upon the fact as to how the presentation of the history and religion of Israel is affected by that view. The sojourn of the ancestors of the Israelites in Canaan would naturally account for the similarity of the laws and religious conceptions of the latter to those of the inhabitants of Canaan, and consequently that syncretism might be pre-Mosaic. Living in Canaan, though in a half-nomadic state, the ancestors of the Hebrews could not have remained unaffected by the civilization, religion, law, and customs prevailing there. Nor are we justified in assigning those Old Testament conceptions which apparently show Babylonian influence to the exilic period as soon as we accept as historical the Biblical statement that Abraham hailed from Ur, or, perhaps, according to another account, from Harran, two of the oldest centres of Mesopotamian civilization.

Moreover, the modern critics, with the exception of the radical

wing, concede it as an historical fact that the Israelites, or a section of them at least, sojourned in Egypt, where they were oppressed by forced labour, and whence they escaped to the desert. But notwithstanding this admission, they generally present the Israelites who left that country as nomads. Consequently, the Mosaic laws are considered from the aspect of a purely nomadic religion. They do not consider that even if the Israelites had been nomads on their entrance into Egypt, the influence of Egyptian culture upon them would have been inevitable, as Egypt was then unsurpassed in art and science by any country in antiquity. Though the Israelites may have dwelt separately in the land of Goshen, their constant contact with the Egyptians could not have been without effect. The proper names Moses, Aaron, Phineas, Hur, evidently show Egyptian influence. The nomadic religion of the Israelites must have undergone certain modifications under the influence of Egypt. Thus for instance, the Egyptians had a priestly caste that attended to all matters of religion. Having been constantly under the influence of the Egyptians, we may reasonably assume that the priestly organization of the Israelites was modelled after that of the Egyptians. Living in a country whose priests were men of high literary attainments, we cannot conceive how the Hebrew priests could have commanded respect and maintained their position among their own people, if they had not more or less emulated the example of the Egyptian priests. It was in their own interest to maintain the religion of their own people and thereby prevent the absorption of the latter into the Egyptians, as in that case they would have lost their position. They could not have been so ignorant as not to be acquainted with the art of writing. We may therefore assume that the Israelites, like the Egyptians, possessed religious books. Only primitive peoples, to whom the art of writing is unknown, transmit religious teachings and records of the past by oral tradition, and the Israelites under Egyptian influence could not have been any longer in a primitive state. Concerning the script they used, it may have been cuneiform, hieroglyphics, or even Phoenician characters, as there is no evidence that the

latter were not already in use in the first part of the second millennium. Ball (*PSBA*. XXX, 1908, pp. 243-4) called attention to a Semitic inscription written in Phoenician characters and reproduced in Petri's *Sinai* (p. 130, Fig. 130), which contains the name *Athtar*. This evidently shows that the Phoenician alphabet must have been known in the Sinaitic peninsula in the time of Thutmosis III (c. 1500-1447). Against this assumption we have merely the argument from silence which is very precarious.

The critical conception entertains no doubt that Israel was without written records in those early times, and that the Biblical accounts are based upon late traditions. If this view be correct, it is indeed questionable whether in those traditions trustworthy recollections of the early period were retained. But the very assumption that the Biblical records are far from being contemporary rests upon the view that the Israelites did not emerge from their primitive half-nomadic state before the establishment of the monarchy, and thus presumes that the Israelites remained untouched by the civilizations of Canaan and Egypt and were still primitive nomads on their entrance into Canaan. But such an assumption rests again upon the contention that the stories of the Patriarchs, the Exodus, and the Conquest are on the whole legendary traditions. The most advanced critics see in the presence of the Israelites in Canaan the result of a gradual settlement, and not of a conquest of that land. Others hold that the tribes of Jacob alone entered Canaan, while those of Israel represent the natives of that country. Some again distinguish between the tribes of Leah and those of Rachel and maintain that the former had never been in Egypt, while the latter entered Canaan under the leadership of Joshua. Concerning the tribes of Bilhah and Zilpah, the prevailing view is that they were Canaanite clans adopted into the union of Israel. The stories of the patriarchal life are considered a late attempt to sketch an instructive and edifying ancestral background for a set of very dissimilar tribes whom some political necessity led to amalgamate into the Hebrew people. The acceptance of such views actually means the rejection of all testimony of the Biblical records and

Hebrew traditions relating to that early period. Thus it is evident that the critical reasoning moves around in a vicious circle. The results obtained would be totally different if we hold that in the Biblical records are not embodied oral traditions but early records partly belonging to a period when the recollections concerning the ancestors of Israel were still vivid, though naturally more or less idealized, and partly almost contemporary with the events. Such a view could be maintained while insisting upon the documentary theory in its essential elements. The records coming from various sources would naturally reflect the views of the various recorders, and we could not but expect conflicting data, and disagreement in style and terminology.

Concerning the historical books of the Bible upon which the modern critics look with deep suspicion, if the Biblical compilers did not merely state the dry facts found in the early records, but added to them their own reflections and viewed them in the light of the religion of Israel, such a presentation does not justify the assumption that the facts recorded are unhistorical. The critical reasoning again moves in a vicious circle. The conclusions would be quite different as soon as we should hold that the Biblical laws date from an early period. Having branded the Book of Deuteronomy as pseudepigraphy, or in plain language, as a forgery, composed by those who pretended to have discovered it, and finding that the historical events narrated are presented in agreement with the views of the Deuteronomical author, they see in the historical presentation fiction rather than truth, invented for the purpose of demonstrating the antiquity of the Deuteronomical laws. The very contention, however, that 'The Book of the Law', discovered under the reign of Josiah, contained only the Book of Deuteronomy presupposes the acceptance of the critical doctrine that the compilation of the Mosaic Books dates from a post-exilic period. But even if we should admit that the latter books in their present form had not existed in pre-exilic times, there is no conclusive evidence that another book or other books similar in form and contents to our Pentateuch had not already existed before the establishment of the monarchy, and that it was

not a book of this kind that was discovered under Josiah. Here again we must point out the fact that such an assumption would not be incompatible with the documentary theory, as textual criticism can have no bearing upon the chronological problems concerning the periods to which the various strata of the Mosaic Books should be assigned. We must then go still further and assume with the great majority of the modern critics, following the lead of Wellhausen, Cornill, &c., that the Prophets were the very creators of Israel's religion as presented in the Mosaic Books, and that all Biblical references to the laws embodied there supposed to belong to earlier periods are unhistorical.

It is sufficient to point out the defective method of the critical reasoning, and there is no need to disprove in detail each point of the critical arguments. The Biblical writings, branded as pseudepigraphs, are on the defensive, and the burden of proof lies with the modern critics. The evidence the higher criticism presents is at best circumstantial, in many details admittedly inconclusive and still under discussion. The problems it raises can fairly be solved in accordance with tradition. Therefore, to say the least, a verdict of Not Proven must be returned. From this point of view the present writer proceeds to review the present contributions to Biblical studies, and to inquire whether recent writers succeeded in substantiating the claims of the critical views. The books reviewed deal with religion, history, and archaeology. The threads of these factors of Biblical studies so continually run from one into another and are so thoroughly interwoven as to preclude a separate treatment of each one. The Biblical studies here treated actually pursue the single aim of presenting these leading factors, though some consider them chiefly from a religious aspect, some chiefly from an historical point of view, and others on the archaeological side. Therefore, we consider it more convenient to review them together, under the headings of Religion, History, and Archaeology.

II. RELIGION.

(1) A highly-important contribution to this subject is J. P. Peters' book *The Religion of the Hebrews*. Considered from a purely literary aspect, it is a very fascinating work, and will be read with delight even by those who do not share the author's views, which on the whole are severely critical. We do not find here the supercilious tone which, as a rule, the modern critics assume toward the Biblical authors, and the book is pervaded by a religious atmosphere, which, however, seems to be incongruous with the radical views it expresses. This work and others of the same kind are characteristic of the influence of modern criticism upon theologians, and the havoc it has wrought upon their mode of thinking, that they are quite unaware of the fact that the reverential tone they adopt toward the religion of Israel ill fits their treatment of the subject. We frequently hear the assertion that modern criticism may be accepted without diminishing the value of the Old Testament as a record of Divine revelation. But it requires childlike simplicity to believe that descriptions of events that never occurred should assume a sacred character because of the moral lessons they teach. Now and then the author becomes restive under the autocratic rule of the German radical school, whose loyal subject he is, and refuses to reject all the Biblical accounts as untrustworthy. As for instance, he does not agree with the radical view that denies to Moses the authorship not merely of the Law as a whole, but practically of any part of it, even of the Decalogue, and which does not admit that Moses taught a monotheism or even a henotheism. Nor does he accept Budde's view that JHWH was the deity of the Kenites whom the Israelites adopted as their own god. He lays stress on the fact that we must not fail to recognize the immense importance of the personal factor of the founder of Israel's religion, and should not reduce him to the ranks and

(1) *The Religion of the Hebrews*. By JOHN PUNNETT PETERS, Ph.D., D.D. (*Handbooks on the History of Religions*, vol. V). Boston and London: GINN & COMPANY, 1914. pp. xii + 502.

make him a creature of his time and age, who had no outlook beyond that of the people among whom he lived and moved. He believes that some at least of the Israelites were closely connected with the tribes of the southern wilderness, as Judah and Simeon, and JHVH may have been their god. He further refuses to accept the view held by most critical scholars that the Ark of the Covenant contained a sacred stone of the nature of a fetish, and not the tablets with the Decalogue, and contends that the latter written on the tablets actually dates from the Mosaic period (see chapter IV). However, the author does not seem to have perceived the far-reaching importance of assigning the written Decalogue to Moses. He places the beginning of Hebrew literature in the times of David and Solomon (see p. 7). But if the Decalogue was actually written by Moses himself, and of course in Phoenician characters, this art of writing must have been well known in the Mosaic period, and what objection could there be to the Biblical testimony that Moses was also the author of other laws beside the Decalogue? What reason is there for the assumption that about three hundred years elapsed between the writing of the Decalogue and the earliest Hebrew records? Shall we assume that with the passing away of Moses the art of writing disappeared from among the Israelites? If the personal factor of Moses was of so great an importance that he was 'towering above his race and time', his existence could not have been without influence on his associates, and therefore does it not stand to reason that some of the latter left written records of their own describing the Mosaic legislation, which were used by later historians? The author evidently failed to perceive that the radical critics did not arbitrarily deny the existence of the written Decalogue and the importance of the founder of Israel's religion. This view was the logical outcome of their critical attitude, as otherwise the fundamental structure of higher criticism would be defective. One cannot serve two masters at the same time, nor can one adhere to the critical view without denying altogether the historicity of the Mosaic legislation.

The book is divided into twenty-nine chapters, which present

the Hebrew religious conceptions from their earliest primitive stage down to the commencement of the Christian era, and contains a chronology and a selected bibliography. The first chapter outlines the sources and methods of study, and illustrates the Hebrew methods of historical and legal composition by that of the Saxon Chronicle. The views, the general dates given, and the tendencies of the different books of the Old Testament described, are in accordance with the results obtained by modern criticism. The second chapter, which describes the land and peoples of Palestine, is rather instructive. The third treats the primitive religion of the Hebrews, which is compared with that of the Arabs. This comparison is no doubt correct even from a traditional point of view, and thus independent of the author's premises that the Hebrews were in a nomadic state before the time of Moses. If Abraham hailed from Babylonia, and nevertheless bears a West Semitic name, his tribe evidently belonged to those Western Semites who invaded Babylonia in the second part of the third millennium. Thus Abraham was by origin an Arab, and his religion, which essentially was that of the pre-Mosaic Hebrews, must have been closely akin to that of the Arabs, though it was no doubt influenced by that of Babylonia, and underwent further modifications on his entrance into Canaan. The fourth chapter discusses the personality of Moses, the nature of the bond by which the tribes of Israel were united to JHVH and to one another, the original habitat of the JHVH-cult, the Ark of the Covenant, and the date, the original form, and interpretation of the Decalogue. The treatment is interesting, and the opinions expressed are rather moderate, but somewhat illogical, as already pointed out. The fifth chapter deals with the religious conceptions of the Canaanites and their influence on the Hebrews, in which the author substantially follows the lead of the critical radicals. The view that the Hebrews adopted legal institutions, rituals, and festivals may be readily accepted even by adherents of the traditional view, as the Hebrews had sojourned in Canaan before they descended into Egypt. The point of departure between the critical and

the conservative views is the date which we should assign to that adoption from the Canaanites. Of scanty interest is the sixth chapter, which briefly outlines the effect of national experiences from the time of the Conquest to the Maccabean period. The seventh and eighth chapters deal with the developments of the priesthood and the ritual. We cannot enter into a detailed examination of the bold views presented there, which are well known. The establishment of the Levitical priesthood may be as old as the Exodus, if not older, and does not necessarily belong to a late period, notwithstanding that kings, chiefs of the tribes, and others, by imitating the example of other nations, arrogated to themselves the priestly office. As to sacrifices, they are as old as the human race, and there is scarcely any doubt that an elaborate sacrificial system had existed long before the Mosaic period. It was among all nations in the interest of the priesthood to have such an intricate system, in order to ensure its position and to make the laity dependent upon its functions. But the indifference of the Hebrews toward the rights of the priesthood is easily understood as soon as we believe in the Biblical account that the establishment of the priestly order was from the very outset not popular with them. This establishment was not quite in accordance with the principle of equality, the basis of the Mosaic legislation, nor with the declaration that Israel should become 'a kingdom of priests'. But Moses may have had an outlook beyond that of his people, and clearly perceived the immense value of a priesthood which in its own interest might become the guardian and preserver of the religion he established, as it actually did. Those who on etymological ground advance the theory that the Levites were of non-Hebrew origin do not consider that we have for the priestly order of the Levitical tribe a complete parallel in the tribe of the Magi among the Iranians. Critics ought to take into consideration the possibility that the Hebrew priestly organization may have possessed from the very beginning a sacred book of its own which fundamentally differed from that of the laity, that it contained all the ritualistic laws, and especially dealt with the

institutions concerning sacrifices, besides the common laws, and thus might not be inaptly designated as the Priestly Code.

Chapters IX–XVII deal with the period between the death of Solomon and the fall of Jerusalem. Though being the most important period in the history of Israel, we need not discuss the views advanced there, as on the whole they are identical with those generally held by modern critics, but here and there the author is somewhat more moderate. As, for instance, he admits that the practical monotheism with which the Writing Prophets begin was already a tenet of the spiritually-minded thinkers of Israel, as it appears in the Jahvistic and Elohist narratives and in the legislative codes embodied in these narratives. But on this point, as well as on others, whenever he tries to deviate from the views of the radical critics the author gets into difficulties out of which he cannot extricate himself. Both the Judæan and Israelite compilations condemn the setting up of the golden calf by Israel (p. 203). But if those documents antedate the period of the Writing Prophets, how can we explain the fact that neither Elijah nor Elisha, and not even Amos, protested against the worship of the golden calves in the sanctuaries of Beth-el and Dan? Further, the author does not accept Wellhausen's opinion, generally shared by modern critics, that the Book of Deuteronomy was composed by those who pretended to have found it, and sees no reason to doubt that it was found as described, but considers it the work of the followers of Isaiah. The author's opinion is scarcely less repugnant than the former, as it simply means that the high priest Hilkiah was imposed upon by the composers of that work.

Chapters XVIII–XXI discuss the theology of Ezekiel, conception of holiness, the exile, and the restoration. The assertion that Ezekiel was profoundly affected by the religion of Babylonia is rather daring, and without the least justification. The statement that in the Code of Holiness, moral, ceremonial, and ecclesiastical laws are placed on the same footing, is inaccurate. Penalty of death was imposed for the transgression of many moral laws, as adultery, incest, sodomy, bestiality, murder, witch-

craft, blasphemy, cursing of the parents, but not upon transgression of ceremonial and ecclesiastical laws. Nor is it accurate to state: 'The inadvertent touching of an unclean thing of which he is not himself conscious, may render him unclean, and bring calamity upon him or upon the whole nation' (Lev. iv-v). The final chapters deal with a variety of subjects, the problem of evil, the development of the law in Babylonia, the New Religion, the Temple, the Synagogue and the Scribes, Persecution and National Revival, Messianic Hope and Future Life. Considering the author's critical attitude, he presents a survey of Israel's religious development on the whole in a clear and masterly manner, though now and then we miss independence of critical judgement.

(2) More radical and therefore more consistent is H. P. Smith's book, *The Religion of Israel*. The object of the work is to give an account of the rise and progress of Israel's religion from its beginnings in the nomadic period down to the event that put an end to the Jewish state by the Romans, and proceeds upon the supposition that the results of higher criticism are fairly certain. The author modestly declares that all that the book claims for itself is that it represents our present knowledge; what the future has in store for us we cannot forecast. Modest as this declaration seems to be, it plainly proclaims that any other presentation that assumes a more moderate view of those subjects is not in accordance with our present knowledge. We need not look to the future for the discovery of new factors which might modify or refute altogether the author's extreme views. Sufficient unto the day is our present knowledge, which the author, however, evidently ignores. He frankly states that he avoided controversy, and expressed his opinions in positive terms. Such a treatment is very convenient, but then we must rely upon the author's authority that he examined the opposing opinions from an unbiassed point of view. However, though the theories and

suggestions contained in this work are by no means 'fairly certain', and ought to have been expressed with some reserve, it must be admitted that the presentation is brilliant and striking, and makes excellent reading. It is so alluring that it impresses the reader that the views presented are original, and the author by his ingenuity succeeded in outdistancing the advanced position of the modern critics. But this is by no means correct, nor is it the claim of the author. His book is a compendium of extremely radical views which, however, had already been suggested by other scholars.

The book consists of twenty chapters. The first chapter surveys the former methods of Old Testament studies which made the Hebrew literature teach a theology, and points out that Biblical theology is an historical science that demands as a prerequisite what is known as higher criticism. It warns against the temptation to make the Law of Moses the starting-point of Israel's history, as with such a presupposition the latter is unintelligible, and briefly outlines the actual process of Israel's development. It distinguishes four stages in the history of Israel, and the presumption is that the religion will correspondingly show four stages. These four divisions are: Nomadic Religion, Agricultural Religion, Prophetism, and Legalism.

The author, in making these divisions, presupposes the critical view which ignores the patriarchal narratives, considering them pure fiction. The Old Testament not only does not make the Law of Moses the starting-point of Israel's history, but actually presupposes a pre-Mosaic religion, which, if divine, Moses could not have abolished, as seen by the blessing of Isaac by the Lord, because Abraham obeyed his voice and kept his charge, his commandments, his statutes, and his laws (Gen. 26. 3-5). If we ignore the critical view, we shall find that the Old Testament actually distinguishes four stages in Israel's history. First comes the nomadic stage in the period of Abraham. It is followed by the agricultural stage in Canaan and Egypt. Then came the stage of being united into a nation under the leadership of Moses, though it was not fully realized until the establishment of the monarchy. The last stage

was that of corruption. Corresponding to these stages, we find the nomadic religion of Abraham, the agricultural religion under the influence of the Canaanites and Egyptians, the legalism under Moses, and finally prophetism. The author's arrangement shows a certain want of logic. Prophetism is certainly not a natural consequence of corruption, but a phenomenon which can be explained only as a protest of those who remained undefiled by the common corruption and faithfully adhered to the Law of Moses. That legalism precedes prophetism is testified to by Amos (2. 4).

The second chapter, which deals with the nomadic religion, contains not a few assertions which are far from being fairly certain. As for instance, the variety of names that are used for God is presented as convincing evidence for the polytheism of the patriarchs. But in the Old Testament, *El* is purely of appellative signification, and not a proper name, as it is used also with the article. The same is of course true of *El Elyon*, and no less of *El Shaddai*, the second element of which is plainly identical with Babylonian *šadū*, 'mountain', and the name evidently means 'the God of the mountains'. But JHVH is certainly a proper name of the God of Israel, though of doubtful meaning. The third chapter discusses Moses and his work, in which the existence of Moses is not denied, though the fact that he taught monotheism is. The fourth describes the period of transition. The worship of the bull in the desert is presented as the plainest evidence for the syncretism, as nomads would not think of paying homage to a bull. However, it may also be taken as evidence that the Israelites who left Egypt were not nomads. In the fifth chapter, which deals with religion in the early literature, the J and E strata are placed in the ninth century, evidently to make them contemporaneous with the rise of the early prophets, though it is admitted that a considerable literature existed in Israel from the time of Solomon at least. Chapters VI-IX discuss the earlier prophets, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Jeremiah. The author agrees with the well-known view that the writings of the prophets have undergone extensive revision by late editors. This view is

a pre-requisite of the higher criticism, as it makes these writings untrustworthy, unless we look to the infallible tribunal of the higher criticism for a decision as to what portions we may accept with some confidence. Any prophetic testimony for the traditional position can easily be ascribed to late post-exilic editors. In the tenth chapter, entitled the Beginnings of Legalism, the Book of Deuteronomy is discussed. Its composition is placed about the time of its discovery, but it is admitted that its contents give no indication that the report of its being found in the Temple is a fiction. The eleventh chapter deals with Ezekiel, who is characterized as one of the least sympathetic of the Old Testament characters. The twelfth chapter is entitled, Legalism Triumphant, in which Leviticus is dated about two centuries after Ezekiel. The statement that the rite of circumcision is punished with the penalty of death is of course incorrect. The thirteenth chapter is entitled Dogmatic Bias, and describes the literary activity of the priestly writers. The remaining chapters bear the titles, the Messianic Hope (XIV), the Spiritualization of the Messianic Hope (XV), the Sceptical Reaction (XVI), Legalism and Practical Problems (XVII), Apocalyptic Development of the Messianic Hope (XVIII), the Treasure of the Humble, i.e. the Psalms (XIX), and the Final Stage (XX). Space forbids us to point out the immense number of statements to which one may reasonably take exception. Dogmatic bias, of which the author accuses the priestly writers, is indeed a chief feature of the modern method. The critical views are settled dogmatically, and the development of the religion of Israel must be in accordance with them.

(3) Largely as a digest of the views presented in the two last volumes may be characterized H. Th. Fowler's book, *The Origin and Growth of the Hebrew Religion*, which is designed to offer a guide for study rather than a new treatise upon the history of Israel's religion. It is divided into twelve chapters. After an

(3) *The Origin and Growth of the Hebrew Religion.* By HENRY THATCHER FOWLER, Professor of Biblical Literature and History in Brown University. THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, Chicago, 1916. pp. 190.

introductory chapter entitled General Survey, there follow chapters on the Deliverance and the Covenant (II), the Wars of Jahveh (III), Religion and National Life (IV), the God of Justice and Love (V), the Exalted God of Nations (VI), Religion and Law (VII), the Discovery of the Individual (VIII), Two Ideals from the Exile (IX), Legalism Triumphant (X), the Two Hopes (XI), and Israel's Contributions to Universal Religion (XII). Each chapter is headed by references for study in both the Old and New Testaments, and at the end of each chapter is given the parallel discussion in the books assigned for supplementary reading. The book contains also two chronological outlines of Hebrew history and literature, and two Appendices, Reference Literature, and Outline for Students' History.

As the author does not claim to present new points of view, we need not enter into details. The arrangement of the material shows good pedagogical sense. But we doubt whether such a guide should be offered for study. The author is evidently deeply solicitous for the spiritual welfare of the Bible students who might fall into the error of seeing in the Old Testament accounts truth instead of fiction, and therefore provides them with a guide to guard them against the pitfalls that beset their way of study and to lead them safely on the path of truth paved with extremely radical views. Authority is invoked versus the Biblical authority in declaring: 'Five generations of minute and painstaking study, in which the work of each scholar has been subjected to the most searching criticism and all available evidence has been constantly re-examined, have resulted in a general consensus of scholarly opinion as to the growth of the Old Testament writings' (p. 6). One may approve or disapprove of a statement calculated to prejudice the minds of the students in relying on the authority of previous investigators. We are not concerned with the question whether that statement is exact, which we may fairly doubt. Nor do we blame the author for his endeavour to convert students to a view of his own conviction. However, we may question whether it is fair and broad-minded to recommend for supplementary reading exclusively books of authors who hold extremely

critical views and none of those whose views are more moderate. We should think that in the literature assigned for reading students ought to be made acquainted with both modern and conservative views in order to be able to judge for themselves. There is but little choice between the critical opinions recommended, and thus students are placed between Scylla and Charybdis. Text-books of this kind illustrate Johns' statement : 'The critical theory is now so firmly rooted in the minds of all scholars *who are not allowed in youth to imagine any alternative*' (17). The chronology is rather inaccurate. We especially wonder on whose authority the author relied in placing Ikhnaton (Amenophis IV) about 1440, which is of course impossible, as there can be no doubt that Thutmosis III died in 1447, and between the latter's death and the accession of Ikhnaton there were three rulers with rather long reigns.

III. HISTORY.

(4) While the last volumes reviewed deal with Israel's religion in the light of history, Is. J. Peritz's book, *Old Testament History*, deals with the history of Israel in the light of Israel's religious development. The book is one of a series of Bible study texts for the purpose of religious education, and therefore the emphasis has been placed upon the distinguished personalities, the religious, moral, and social ideas, and fundamental institutions of the Old Testament rather than upon mere historical events; and the latter have been dealt with only in so far as they are needed to explain the historical background of the former. In each section the Biblical text which is the basis of discussion is indicated in the margin. The material is presented in three parts: the formative period (from the beginnings to the death of Solomon), the period of the Prophets (from the division of the kingdom to the restoration under Cyrus), and the period of the priests and

4) *Old Testament History*. By ISMAR J. PERITZ, Ph.D., Professor of Biblical Languages and Literatures and Willard Ives Professor of the English Bible, Syracuse University (*Bible Study Textbook Series*). THE ABINGTON PRESS, New York, Cincinnati, 1915. pp. 336 and 5 maps.

scribes (from Cyrus to Herod), and in an introduction. The whole is divided into fourteen chapters, which are separated into subdivisions. At the end of each chapter are given suggestions for study. The book contains also a map of the Old Testament world, and a selected bibliography.

The author certainly succeeded in producing a scholarly and highly instructive work. The presentation of the critical views is very sympathetic, as they are expressed with a certain reserve, and the possibility of more moderate views is often freely admitted. As for instance, it is admitted as reasonable that what Moses had experienced among the Kenites was a revival of ancestral religion, forgotten in the foreign and adverse Goshen environment, and now once more brought to the Hebrew tribes' instinct with a new enthusiasm. Further, it is conceded that there is not sufficient ground for denying that the first great expression of the laws contained in the seven distinct codes for Israel was by the inspired wisdom of Moses, though it is no longer possible to determine exactly which parts go back to his time. The objection that the Book of Covenant reflects a considerably advanced state of society is met by the argument that when the semi-agricultural mode of life at Kadesh is recognized, more of that code will find a suitable origin in Mosaic times. From this point of view it is considered as possible that the three harvest festivals in an early form belong also to this time. It is further assumed that with the institution of the new religion came that of the priesthood, who should perform the functions connected with the sacrifices, the Ark, and the oracle. As to the literary and historical character of the patriarchal stories, it is admitted that there are elements in them that rest upon substantial facts of history, though allowance must be made for their shaping and embellishment.

However, these deviations from the current critical opinions should by no means be taken as evidence that the author belongs to the small remnant of the moderate critics. Nor is there any reason to imagine that the author has toned down some of the current views in deference to the religious sentiments of the

societies under whose auspices the series to which his book belongs is published. This book is a true product of the spirit of our age and abounds with extremely critical views. The results of higher criticism are enthusiastically accepted and religiously upheld. The author ventures even to declare that there is practical religious value in Biblical criticism. But on several points the author shows more independence of judgement and clearly perceives the defects of the modern methods in converting mere theories resting upon evidence that is far from being conclusive into undeniable historical facts.

However, there is one point on which we regret to see poor judgement. He observes: 'When one reads the regulations as to how and when to recite one of the sublimest ethical passages in the Old Testament, containing the words: "Hear, O Israel: Jehovah our God, Jehovah is One: and thou shalt love Jehovah thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might" (Deut. 6. 4 f), and notices the rabbinical quibbling over the question whether it is to be recited standing or lying, audibly or inaudibly, as early in the morning when one can distinguish between the colours of sky-blue or leek-green, and finds no reference to its ethical import, one realizes how shallow, after all, must have been the interest in keeping the law' (p. 329). Did the author not consider that the very existence of Israel testifies to the Jewish sublime conception of the ethical import of these words? Were not the same Rabbis who quibbled over that question willing to undergo unspeakable martyrdom for the truth of these words? The numberless millions of Jews who underwent the most atrocious persecutions and sacrificed their lives for their adherence to these words during a period of more than two thousand years ought to show that their interest in these words was anything but shallow. The Rabbis quibble over the question because of the sublime import of this confession of faith.

(5) Of a more moderate though strictly critical tendency is

(5) *The Biblical History of the Hebrews*. By F. J. FOAKES-JACKSON, D.D., Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge, and Hon. Canon of Peterborough. Cambridge: W. HEFFER & SONS, LTD., 1917. pp. xxxii + 440 and 4 maps.

F. J. Foakes-Jackson's book, *The Biblical History of the Hebrews*, which is primarily intended for students in theology, and endeavours to tell the story of Israel from a Biblical standpoint. This is not a new book but a reprint of the third edition of 1909. The success it gained on its former publications is well merited, as it is in every respect an excellent work, thoroughly scientific and well adapted to make the student acquainted with the current problems of modern criticism, which, however, are presented with less confidence than is customary at present, and on points where the evidence against the Biblical accounts appears to be somewhat doubtful, the Biblical authors are given the benefit of the doubt. Concerning the historical value of the Biblical records, the position is taken that the Bible is practically the sole source of information for most of Israel's history, and its testimony even on this ground is of the highest importance. The documentary theory furnishes scope for a certain amount of critical discernment, as it continually suggests the question whether the view taken of certain events is that of the age in which they occurred or in some subsequent period. Under these circumstances a good deal of conjecture is allowable, but its results can never take the place of historical facts. That there are difficulties in the Biblical narrative cannot be denied, but the presence of contradictions real or apparent need not make tradition valueless, and it is frequently the case that the discovery of fresh evidence has re-established a tradition which has been pronounced by experts to be incredible. Unless there is positive evidence against any tradition it should meet with respect, and this rule applies with special force to the Scriptures of Israel.

Notwithstanding the full acceptance of the documentary theory, the author admits that there is no reason why the Hebrews from the patriarchs downward should not have had a literature of their own. An Israelitish tribe is especially mentioned as famous for its scribes in a very early poem. But while there is no presumption against the possibility of an early literature, there is no proof of its existence till the ninth and eighth centuries. Those who hold a conservative view ought to be

satisfied with such a concession coming as it does from a critical scholar who displays sound judgement and is able to see both sides of the questions under consideration. In assigning the Book of Deuteronomy to the days of Manasseh, the author candidly confesses that there is a most natural repugnance to attribute one of the most earnest and spiritual Books of the Scriptures to one who used the venerable name of Moses to advance his own opinions, and believes that the only way of escaping from this dilemma is the presumption that such a literary artifice is not as abhorrent to Orientals as it would be to us.

As to the fact that miracle and prophecy play an important part in the history of Israel, the author admits that the whole question is one of extreme difficulty, and though the human mind under the influence of modern ideas has the greatest difficulty in believing in an interruption in the course of nature, no one has been able to prove that such interruption has never taken place. A purely rationalistic account of such a people as Israel is not likely to give a correct impression. Of special interest are the following observations of the author, which are worthy to be quoted: 'Indeed, the wonderful story of the chosen people is in itself a greater miracle than any exhibition of Divine power it records. It is absolutely unique in the history of humanity. No nation can show a record resembling it. That a people possessing their full share of human frailty, not naturally given to idealism, nor easily touched by appeals to their better nature, with apparently no special aptitude for religion, but hard-hearted and stiff-necked as their teachers describe them, should have existed for ages without country or sanctuary, or any external coercion, simply for an idea, would be incredible if it were not a fact. That the extraordinary tenacity with which the Jews have clung to their religion was due to a discipline which probably began in Egypt in the thirteenth century B.C. or earlier, and ended not much more than a century after the foundation of Rome, is almost beyond belief, and yet it is sober truth. . . . All these things point to the fact that throughout its long, eventful, and painful

story Israel has been upheld by some external power not its own ; and that the Jew has outlasted so many proud empires and ancient races is a miracle beside which the mere drying-up of the Red Sea, that his ancestors might escape from Egypt, need hardly cause more than a passing feeling of surprise.'

The subject is treated in fourteen chapters, as far as the sources of the Canonical Books of the Old Testament are available, and in several appendices, in which the extra-Biblical sources are discussed. The introduction is very instructive. Not the least valuable part of the book are the numerous notes to each chapter given at the end of the book, which contain an abundance of information, and are highly suggestive. It is on the whole truly a *Biblical History*, and may be safely recommended to those who want to study Israel's history in connexion with that of the Old Testament, and is at the same time a storehouse of valuable suggestions.

(6) Of quite a different character is W. G. Blaikie's book, *A Manual of Bible History*, which is a strictly Christian-orthodox work that presents Israel's history and the rise and establishment of Christianity in accordance with the sources of the Old and New Testaments, which are considered from the point of view that the Scriptures are given by the inspiration of God, and therefore the accounts they give are beyond all doubt and all argument. There is not the least reference to critical methods or the documentary theory. However, though the results of modern criticism are totally ignored, the treatment is by no means indifferent toward other results of scientific research. It constantly refers to modern discoveries, and also considers the parallel history and progress of the leading nations of the world, showing what was going on elsewhere while the history of the Bible was being enacted. Throughout the whole book there are constant references and allusions to the rise of Christianity. It

(6) *A Manual of Bible History*, in connexion with *The General History of the World*. By Rev. WILLIAM G. BLAIKIE, D.D., LL.D. New edition revised and enlarged. London: T. NELSON & SONS, 1912. pp. viii + 504 and 12 maps and plans.

is not so much a Bible history in the true sense of the term as an historical interpretation of the Biblical events and a commentary on the Scriptures from a purely Christian point of view, which is intended to be used in connexion with the study of the Old and New Testaments.

The usefulness of this work for Christian Bible students is very little impaired by its strictly traditional tendency, though its value would have been greatly enhanced if it did not entirely ignore the attitude of the critical school. A presentation of history on traditional lines ought to take full cognizance of the critical views, and argue in favour of the traditional conception in exposing the weak spots in the former conception. But it is fair to state that in recent times we very seldom meet with books by conservative authors in which the views of the critics are not seriously considered and thoroughly discussed, and, on the other hand, there is a growing tendency among the latter to disregard the conservative attitude altogether. However, there is no scarcity of works that expound the higher criticism, and information on this subject is easily accessible, but in recent years very few books made their appearance that treat the Biblical accounts as real history. Thus this book, which gives the Bible history from a purely Biblical point of view, frequently in the light of the information furnished by Assyrian and Egyptian monuments, besides being decidedly useful to Bible students who denounce all critical doubts concerning the facts recorded in the Scriptures, might also be instructive for those who hold different views in becoming acquainted with the Christian traditional conception of the Biblical history.

The book is divided into sixteen chapters, of which I-XIII deal with the Old Testament history, XIV with the interval between the Old and New Testaments, and the two last chapters with the rise of Christianity: Gospel History and Apostolic History. Each chapter falls into several sections. The inferences drawn from the extra-Biblical sources are on the whole reasonable. A discussion of the author's views would be quite impossible within the space available. But we may mention

a few characteristic points. It is rather curious to find the statement, 'It is now the general belief that the Book of Job was not written till about the time of Solomon' (p. 87). Darius of the Book of Daniel is identified with Cyaxares, who of course never existed, and is a pure invention of Xenophon in his *Cyropaedia*, as we know from Nabunaid's inscription that Astyages, the last king of the Medes, was overthrown by Cyrus. Nebuchadnezzar is represented as the conqueror of Egypt, a presumption purely based upon Ezekiel's prophecies (29-32), which is of course unhistorical. But the book as a whole will prove a source both of information and edification for those who share the author's point of view. The maps and plans and the list of Biblical names will be especially useful.

(7) To the works which deal with Hebrew history archaeologically may be assigned Laura H. Wild's book, *The Evolution of the Hebrew People*, which, though outlining the Hebrew history from the earliest period down to the establishment of Christianity, is less a history than an introduction to Biblical history. Its main object is to point out how far Hebrew ideas contributed to the present civilization. The historical conception is thoroughly in accordance with the critical views. Its starting-point is the tracing of the development of pre-historic man, the great racial groups, and of religious ideas before the rise of the Hebrews. Its leading idea is that the principle of evolution must be applied to Bible history as to every branch of human knowledge. Society to-day is the product of the past, and indebted to many sources for the influences that have made communal life at present what it is, and not the least of these influences is the influence that has come from the social and spiritual ideals of the Hebrew people. The Bible is of tremendous importance to-day, because its social programme, touching directly upon political, national, and international policies, is not a cut-and-dried effort of some

(7) *The Evolution of the Hebrew People and their Influence on Civilization.* By LAURA H. WILD, Professor of Biblical History and Literature in Mount Holyoke College. New York: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, 1917. pp. xi + 311 and 2 maps.

person's brain superimposed upon society, but the gradual working out, through the terrible birth pangs of racial development, of vital racial truths.

The book consists of five parts, which are divided into thirty-one chapters. Part I gives the cultural background of Hebrew life, and describes the discoveries of ancient monuments, the four stages of man's development, the four main groups of men, and the three groups of the Caucasian races, and the highest type among each of these groups. It also examines the reasons for the early supremacy of the Mediterranean races, the place of Semitic thought in the development of the Western races, and points out the differences between the Indo-European and Semitic ways of thinking. Part II gives a sketch of the development of religious ideas, describing the various kinds of early beliefs, as animism, fetichism, totemism, ancestor-worship, &c., the philosophic basis of early theology, polytheism, henotheism, and monotheism, and discusses traces of early beliefs and customs in the Bible, and the gradual development of prophetic conceptions. Part III considers the influence of physical environment upon the development of the Hebrew race. Part IV, under the caption 'Israel's Economic and Social Development', surveys the whole Hebrew history from the patriarchal period down to the final destruction of the Jewish state. Part V, entitled 'The Place in World Thought of the Great Prophetic Hebrew Teachers', points out the more enduring messages of the Old Testament prophets, and the conceptions of Jesus and Paul.

This book is a highly-interesting and stimulating work, as it frequently exhibits keen and discerning judgement, the subject is treated in a clear and attractive style, and there is a ring of sincere enthusiasm for the Biblical ideals. It also contains a great amount of information generally not considered in connexion with Biblical studies. Though the teaching of Jesus is presented in terms of boundless admiration, the book shows a remarkable degree of tolerance toward his opponents. It is a relief to be spared at least for once the stale accusation against the hypocrisy of the Pharisees and their dead formalism.

Interesting is the remark: 'The striking characteristic of the Hebrew race is that, notwithstanding all apostasy, there did persist throughout the centuries from early nomadic days a nucleus of people so loyal to their ideals that hardship and persecution of the severest kind that history records could not break up and dissipate the truth they had to bring to the world' (p. 289). Does the author refer to antiquity or to the Christian era? The economic conceptions of the Talmud and its regulations for the welfare of the masses are highly appreciated, though it is admitted that 'some of these numerous laws seem to deal with very trivial matters'. An opinion like, 'the more we study the Rabbinical Code the more we admire its provisions' (p. 261), is rarely encountered in contemporary literature. Concerning the principal theme of the book, the thought of evolution as applied to Bible history, we shall see what the next book has to say on this subject.

(8) That a thoroughly scientific treatment of Biblical history can be brought into full agreement and harmony with the traditional conceptions is the position taken in S. Jampel's book, *Vorgeschichte Israels und seiner Religion*. The author, an orthodox Rabbi and a pre-eminent Talmudist, and well known as a Biblical scholar by his previous works, in which he demonstrates that Hebrew tradition is not in danger of being overthrown by the result of modern discoveries and scientific methods, pursues the same tendency in this work. It is a popular presentation of both the pre-history and the religion of Israel in accordance with the ancient Hebrew traditions and the contemporary inscriptions. Its leading idea is that the cuneiform inscriptions furnish the real material for the pre-history of the Hebrews and their religion, of which the framework is presented in the Biblical and Talmudic traditions. Its starting-point is that the idea of evolution and development holds true of other nations, as they dissolved themselves into separate tribal bodies while still in a primitive stage, and from the outset of their separate existence

(8) *Vorgeschichte Israels und seiner Religion*. Von Rabbiner Dr. SIGMUND JAMPEL, Schwedt a/O. Frankfurt a. Main: J. KAUFFMANN, 1913. pp. 259.

had to work out their development independently. Israel, however, was not born an infant, as it were, but had gone through all stages of infancy, while being an embryo in the body of the Babylonian people, before it had a separate existence as a people. When the first Hebrew families detached themselves from the Babylonian race, the latter had already attained to its full maturity, and its culture had already reached its zenith. The separate existence of all other nations preceded by centuries or millenniums their characteristic religions. But the religion of Israel preceded its national existence. The separation of the first Hebrew families from the main body of the Babylonian people was caused by differences of religious conceptions. The Hebrew tribe in its beginning was merely a religious sect among the Babylonians. The author might have illustrated the condition of the first Hebrews who left Babylonia due to religious differences by that of the Puritans who left England for the same reason. Therefore, the principal objection to the Biblical account of the early history of the Hebrews, which is based upon the ethnological law that no people knows its real origin, because it must pass through a period of infancy, during which it has no sense for historical recollections, while in its maturity the events of this early period are already obliterated, is refuted.

Further, the critics who cannot see any reason why the patriarchs of Israel should be treated differently from the legendary ancestors of the Grecian tribes, as Dorus, Ion, Achæus, &c., ought first to prove the unhistorical character of the latter. At present we possess numerous inscriptions and monuments of the Babylonian king Sargon I, the Egyptian king Menes, the Assyrian queen Semiramis, yet these rulers were not long ago generally held to be merely mythical figures, and experiences like those ought to teach us to be more cautious in the treatment of ancient heroes. It is absurd to deny their existence because of the legends woven around their memories. It is more reasonable to see, with Euhemerus, in the mythology of all nations a later deification of ancient heroes than to regard ancient history as pure mythology. If Israel preserved its memories of the past

more clearly and in a more correct form, it is due to the fact that in its infancy it attended a better school among the Babylonians than other nations among their more primitive ancestors.

The subject is treated in twenty-four chapters, of which the fifth is missing in the copy before the reviewer. Chapter I discusses the beginning of civilization according to Biblical and extra-Biblical traditions, in which Babylonia is regarded as the cradle of all Oriental civilizations. It largely deals with the Table of Nations. It is pointed out that Biblical tradition knew that the original inhabitants of Babylonia were neither Semites nor Aryans, and assigned them to the Hamitic group of nations, in tracing their descent from *Kush*, the first son of Ham, and we know at present that the earliest Sumerian rulers belonged to the dynasty of *Kish*. Chapter II deals with the formation of nations according to Biblical and extra-Biblical sources. The opinion advanced that the nations of Abyssinia and Nubia, which in the inscriptions are called *Kash* and *Kesh*, are identical with the Kassites will hardly be accepted. Chapter III investigates the origin of the Hebrew Palestinian civilization. The non-Semitic origin of the Phoenicians and their close relationship to the Egyptians is demonstrated. But the arguments for this view are rather doubtful. Chapter IV treats of the origin of the Israelites. The arguments of the critics against the Biblical accounts of this period are thoroughly discussed. Chapter VI investigates the Biblical and pre-Biblical conceptions of God. Among the early Babylonians there may have been some whose religious conceptions were not inferior to those of Melchizedek. We may surely assume that other Palestinian priests shared the latter's religious conceptions. The opinions of many Assyriologists that the Hebrews are indebted to the Babylonians for many of their religious conceptions are in full agreement with the Jewish traditions that the patriarchs acquired their religious training in 'the Schools of Shem and Eber'. Chapter VII demonstrates the influence of the old Semitic civilization upon that of the Aryans. Chapter VIII discusses the influence of the Sumerians upon the Semites, and

IX, the relation of the *ancient Hebrew* civilization to that of the other Semites, and especially deals with the West Semitic or *Hebrew* proper names, and with the Code of Hammurabi. In order to understand the author's arguments, we must explain that the West Semites who entered Babylonia are designated as *ancient Hebrews*. Of special importance are Chapters X–XIII, which investigate the pre-Mosaic laws of the Hebrews, the relation of the *ancient-Hebrew* laws to the oral traditions of Judaism, the connexion between the Biblical and pre-Biblical laws, and the connexion between the *ancient-Hebrew* laws and the oral traditions. The view is taken that the pre-Mosaic laws are on the whole identical with those of the Code of Hammurabi, some of which still survived in the oral traditions; the former for the most part were incorporated into the Biblical laws, though some were modified and others distinctly abrogated; and in many cases we can plainly see that the oral traditions date from a pre-Mosaic period, and thus may claim a higher antiquity than the Biblical laws. The remaining chapters are: Religious Connexions between the *Ancient Hebrews* and the Bible (XIV), Biblical and Ancient Semitic New Years (XV), Israelitish and Ancient Semitic Allegories (XVI), Ancient Semitic Paganism (XVII), Biblical and Ancient Semitic Angelologies (XVIII), Religious Poetries of the Bible and of the Ancient Semites (XIX), the Biblical and the Noachian Commandments (XX), Biblical and Pre-Biblical Festivals (XXI), Biblical and Old-Semitic Festivals (XXII), Biblical and Pre-Biblical Sacrifices (XXIII), Conclusions (XXIV).

This book is one of the very few in recent Biblical research which abound with original ideas, though not a few of them will provoke dissent. Within the compass of a review it is quite impossible to give even an indication of the salient points of this work. Many of the views presented deserve the most serious consideration. However, the author on many points falls into the error of the modern critics, in stating his opinions in positive terms and presenting mere suggestions as facts. There is no need to establish the truth of the Biblical accounts but to show

that the critical objections are inconclusive. Another defect of his methods is that he does not verify each of his statements by notes referring to the literature bearing on the subjects under discussion. The references given in the 'Anhang' are more of a general character and do not serve this purpose. Finally, the author ought to have discussed the documentary theory, unless this subject was treated in the fifth chapter which is missing. But notwithstanding these omissions, the book is an excellent contribution to Biblical research.

IV. ARCHAEOLOGY.

(9) While the books hitherto reviewed deal with the religion and history of Israel in the light of extra-Biblical sources, the following works deal chiefly with the latter sources as far as they illustrate the Biblical subjects. An archaeological work of a strictly conservative tendency is Naville's book, *Archaeology of the Old Testament*, with the sub-title, *Was the Old Testament written in Hebrew?* The object of this work is to defend the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and to account for the objections of the critics to such a belief by a very remarkable theory that the Books of the Old Testament, as we know them in their Hebrew form, are not in the original language written by their authors. Against the current assumption that the Books of the Old Testament are in the language used by their authors, and that they went through one change only, that of the script, the author puts forward the following facts: Before Moses, and after his time, Babylonian cuneiform was used in Palestine for official documents, contracts, and anything connected with law. In a later period Aramaic was the book form of the Babylonians and Assyrians. The Jews who settled in Egypt wrote and spoke Aramaic. Finally, the script peculiar to the Hebrew language is not derived

(9) *Archaeology of the Old Testament. Was the Old Testament written in Hebrew?* By ÉDOUARD NAVILLE, D.C.L., LL.D., F.S.A., Foreign Associate of the Institute of France, Professor of Egyptology at the University of Geneva. New York, Chicago: FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY, 1913. pp. xii + 212 (*Library of Historic Theology*).

from the Canaanite, but from the Aramaic alphabet. He thinks that the historical value of these facts has not been fully grasped by the critics, and that history, and not philological criticism, is the point of view from which these discoveries have to be studied. Considering the fact that the written language in the whole of Western Asia was cuneiform, the author concludes that Moses wrote in the latter language, which was pre-eminently that of laws, though he may have spoken with his countrymen the dialect they had brought from Canaan, which, however, was not a written language, but the popular idiom.

The objections of the critics that in the Pentateuch nothing comes directly from Moses, the author refutes by reviewing historically what is written about Egypt, Joseph's life, the Exodus, and the Tabernacle, and points out that all these things could not have been so exactly described by various authors living in different parts of Palestine and at different epochs; and that especially the story of Joseph could not have been written down except by a man who was in Egypt at the time when the tradition was still vivid, when the Hebrews were still in Egypt, and while they knew whose action had induced them to settle there.

The author contends that all these narratives were written not as a running book, but on tablets, and that this fact changes completely the character of the composition, as it explains repetitions as the summaries of what has been said in previous tablets. We can further distinguish the tablets which were written separately and afterwards joined together in a book, like the beginning of Genesis, from those which were to form a series and are accordingly more closely linked together. Therefore the style of composition is no longer to be judged according to the rule set down for a book. He believes that a copy of Deuteronomy was put in the foundation of Solomon's Temple, and that this book bears the character of the last words of Moses, and of a time when the people were in sight of Canaan, when they could see better in what country they were going to settle, who were the inhabitants, and what their customs.

The author thus holds that the Pentateuch was written by Moses in cuneiform on tablets and continued to be in the same form from Moses down to the exilic period. The first transformation it went through was to be put into Aramaic, and this he attributes to Ezra, as such an enterprise seems to be in accordance with his character, and with Rabbinic tradition concerning him ; and it agrees also with the circumstances of his time, as it was the epoch when cuneiform was being more and more abandoned for the popular language. And it is quite possible, as the tradition of the Rabbis alleges, that Ezra also settled the Canon of the Scriptures for the Old Testament, and may have collected and sifted the writings which were to form the sacred volume, but as it came out of his hands the volume was entirely Aramaic. On the other hand, the Books of the Prophets and the didactic Books, even if they were not originally composed in Aramaic, as perhaps some of the Psalms, must have been put in that language before the time of LXX. This change of form and script cannot be called a real translation ; it was only a dialectical modification.

Having established an Aramaic form for the Old Testament, the author finally explains the transition to the Hebrew language and script, as these two changes were simultaneous, which were effected at the time of the Christian era : ‘When the Rabbis wished to give to their religion, to their laws, to their national life which rests entirely on their Books a thoroughly exclusive character, they made a dialectal modification ; they turned their Books into the language spoken at Jerusalem ; but since that had no script, they had to invent one, and they adopted a modified form not of the Canaanite but of Aramaic, the one real book-language which they already knew. Between the new script and the old one there was no greater difference than between the two idioms.’

The book consists of two parts, each of which deals chiefly with the results of one of the two great discoveries, the Amarna tablets, and Aramaic papyri of Elephantine, and is divided into seven chapters : the Language (I), Genesis before the Sojourn in Egypt (II), Egypt (III), the Journey to Canaan (IV), the Papyri

from Elephantine (V), Aramaic (VI), and the Present Form of the Old Testament (VII). Each chapter is subdivided according to the subject-matter. Having given a digest of the author's views, there is no need to enter into the details, which, however, are exceedingly instructive. Before expressing any opinion on the author's theories, we must consider the next volume, which was published two years later and deals with the same subject.

(10) The same theories are upheld in Naville's second book, *The Text of the Old Testament*, which contains three lectures delivered before the British Academy. In the first lecture the author points to the changes brought about in our views in regard to ancient history by archaeology, and to Israel's influence on mankind that is exclusively due to its books, to whose study the same methods must be applied. But in the study of Israel's history we are confronted with two contrary conceptions, one that rests on tradition, and the other of the higher criticism, in which the destructive part is predominant. In discussing the methods and results of the latter, the author examines the lines of evidence upon which it relies, and tests its results according to its principles. In the two other lectures, the author on the whole upholds his former views.

Leaving aside for the moment the author's theories, there is no doubt a great deal of truth in his arguments which cannot be lightly dismissed. This is especially true of the part that investigates the historicity of many narratives in Genesis and Exodus. The author, being an Egyptologist of high repute, is an authority on the question whether these narratives are even in small details in accordance with what is known of ancient Egypt. This is an immensely important point, far more than the problem whether these narratives were actually written by Moses, in which the author is chiefly interested. The author is certainly correct in sharply criticising the radical views of the modern critics, but goes too far in condemning Pentateuchal criticism altogether.

(10) *The Text of the Old Testament*. By ÉDOUARD NAVILLE, D.C.L., LL.D., D.Litt., F.S.A. *The Schweich Lectures, 1915* (*The British Academy*). London: HUMPHREY MILFORD, 1916. pp. viii + 82.

Without considering the philological aspect of the problem, we cannot see any reasonable objection to the author's views that many of the narratives of Genesis were originally written in cuneiform, and that Moses himself used this *script* for his legislation. We say intentionally 'script' and not 'language'. His theory would have been less revolutionary, and might have been more favourably considered, if he had insisted that Moses used the cuneiform script as a medium for the Hebrew language, and we actually possess examples of this kind in the Amarna Glosses. If other Asiatic nations used this script for their own idioms, why not the Hebrews? But his own view could be readily accepted while insisting upon the documentary theory. The principal reason for the assumption that both the Jahvist and Elohist recorded oral traditions is the current belief that the Phoenician alphabet had not yet existed in an early period. But in the light of such a theory, we might assume that both these early writers translated cuneiform tablets of the Mosaic period, each according to his own style. Such a view would of course be rejected by those who insist upon the non-historical character of those narratives. But these extreme views are becoming more and more untenable in the face of archaeological evidence, to which also the author made a notable contribution.

However, it must be confessed that the author's books are in a high degree uncritical in many of their positions. We wonder whether the author is well acquainted with the language of the *Mishnah*, which according to his theory must be contemporary with the rendering of the Scriptures into the Hebrew idiom. No scholar ever paid a greater compliment to the Rabbis than the author in crediting them with the rendering of the Aramaic Bible into the classic Hebrew of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Job, Lamentations, &c. We wonder whether the author has thoroughly compared the present Targumim and the Peshitta with the Hebrew text, so as to have a clear conception of the gigantic task of rendering an Aramaic version in the present Hebrew form. We further wonder whether the author has investigated the style and language of the various Biblical books, whose peculiarity

could scarcely have been retained if they had passed through a translation, unless he should hold that this peculiarity is due to the distinct style of the several Rabbinical translators. We may also doubt whether the author has given due consideration to the clumsy and awkward style of the Amarna letters and to the beautiful form of the Pentateuch, unless he should assume that the knowledge of the cuneiform language of Moses and the other Biblical writers was also a part of divine inspiration, and thus far superior to that of their contemporaries.

However, we cannot see how the author's theory in *its entirety* would account for the difference in style and usages of certain words and expressions in the various parts of the Pentateuch, which is the main evidence for its composite character, unless he should attribute this difference either to the work of various translators under the direction of Ezra, or to that of the various Rabbinical translators. But we regret to state that very frequently the author's argumentation is far from being strictly scientific. From a purely historical point of view it is quite irrelevant whether the Biblical narratives referring to the early history of the Hebrews were written by Moses or by another author as long as they have a real historical basis. For the history of Israel's religion it matters not whether the Pentateuch in its present form was written by Moses, but whether the laws embodied there are of Mosaic origin. If the author used the historical method, he ought to have considered the remarkable phenomenon that Moses should have presented his laws to Israel not in the form of a code, but in that of an history or biography which certainly stands without an historical parallel. This may have been the case, but we have no argument against those who deny that Moses should have deviated from the usage of other legislators. But the main error of the author is that he argues against the advanced critics and entirely ignores the position of those who recognize the documentary theory, but do not deny the Mosaic origin of the Biblical laws nor the historicity of the Biblical narratives.

(11) Another archaeological work of a strictly conservative tendency is J. Politeyan's book, *Biblical Discoveries in Egypt, Palestine, and Mesopotamia*, the object of which is to furnish evidence in support of the Biblical tradition. The Biblical history is interpreted not only in the light of the archaeological remains, but also occasionally in accordance with the results of natural science. As for instance, it points out that the broad outline of the facts of the Creation narrative, Gen. 1, though not written in scientific terms, is in harmony with science, and this chapter has evoked even the admiration of Prof. Heackel, whose observation is quoted. Concerning the unity of the human race, several anthropologists are quoted who hold that there is nothing in the diversity of the various races inconsistent with the belief that all men have descended from a single pair, because man has developed diversely under the influence of social, physical, and climatic surroundings. As to the unity of language, an authority is quoted that there are some 170 ancient monosyllabic roots which are common to the three main groups of languages.

The book is the results of lectures given to a 'summer school' in connexion with the London Jews' Society. It consists of six chapters, and contains a chronology of the Old Testament, a chronological chart, and a bibliography. Leaving aside the numerous interpretations, which are somewhat forced and of homiletic rather than of exegetical character, the book on the whole is interesting and valuable, as the subject-matter is dealt with in a brief style, and it contains a large amount of useful information. It is not intended for the student, but for the general reader, to whom it will no doubt prove both instructive and edifying. Though there is no first-hand information, the author has consulted a large number of authorities on archaeology and other matters, and understands how to apply this knowledge to Biblical subjects in a rather original way.

(11) *Biblical Discoveries in Egypt, Palestine, and Mesopotamia*. By the Rev. J. POLITEYAN, B.A. With Foreword by the Rev. Canon R. B. GIRDLESTONE, M.A. London: ELLIOT STOCK, 1915. pp. x+194, 2 maps, and 14 illustrations.

(12) A similar work of a conservative tendency is J. Baikie's book, *Lands and Peoples of the Bible*, the aim of which is to provide a background upon which to project the Scripture narrative, and to enable the reader to form some conception of the great lands and nations with whom the Hebrews had to deal. The author lays no claim to be original in this work, as its main function is to present in small compass facts for which the student might otherwise have to seek through large and costly treatises. The book consists of three sections, which are divided into fourteen chapters. It seems that the interest of the author in the archaeology of the Old Testament is only so far as it lies at the basis of the Christian faith. This is especially true of the first section, which deals with the leading features of Palestine and their significance, Southern Palestine, Samaria and Galilee, and the peoples of Palestine, and which may rightly be termed Christian archaeology. As a whole, the subject is presented from the point of view of the New Testament, and the chief interest centres in the condition of Palestine at the rise of Christianity. The author judges the character of the people of Judaea by their attitude toward Jesus, which accordingly is painted in dark and unsympathetic colours. But there are other points in this section of more general interest, especially the chapter which deals with the ancient inhabitants of Palestine—the Horites, the Hittites, the Amorites, and the Philistines, whose characters are illustrated by the recent excavations in Palestine. The treatment would be more sound if the views expressed were given as suggestions and not as absolute facts. Thus, for instance, it is wrong to state that the Israelites knew next to nothing about the Horites, since according to the Biblical traditions, in which the author firmly believes, the Horites still existed at the period of the Patriarchs. This fact alone shows that they cannot be identified with the pre-historic 'cave-dwellers'. Their identification with the Hittite-Mitanni *Harri* is more probable. Nor is there any reason for

(12) *Lands and Peoples of the Bible*. By JAMES BAIKIE, F.R.A.S.
London: ADAM and CHARLES BLACK, 1914. pp. xii + 288.

the emphatic assertion that the invention of the Phoenician alphabet was due to the Philistines. This was first suggested by Macalister for the purpose of vindicating the honour of the Aryan Philistines, whose name has become a byword for common and stupid people.

Highly interesting is the discussion of the religious customs of the Canaanites as revealed by the excavations. 'The charge of iniquity' made against the Canaanite races in the Old Testament has been proved by absolutely unimpeachable evidence that comes from the hands of the Canaanites themselves; it vindicates the morality of the Old Testament, which commanded their destruction. In all the arguments directed to prove the defective morality of the Old Testament, this command never fails to come to the front. The author observes: 'There are some dreadful things which are in reality merely sanitary measures; and if ever carnage was "God's daughter" it was when the Israelites swept away, not half thoroughly enough, the abominations with which the iniquity of the Amorite had cursed the land of promise' (p. 67). But we may add that the human sacrifices to which the author refers could not have been native to the religion of the Palestinian Semites, as we might otherwise have found them among the Babylonians, and cannot have been due to Egyptian influence either. But there can be no doubt that the practice of human sacrifice was one of the distinct features of the Greek religion down to the sixth century. If the Aryans exercised any influence upon the Canaanite civilization this Canaanite practice may be due to them.

The second section deals with the Assyrians and Babylonians. The description is fairly accurate, but the chronology is obsolete. The third section deals with Egypt and the less-known nations. Special points of interest are the references to the Biblical religion and history. As for instance, the question is discussed whether the Egyptian religion modified that of the Hebrews, and it is pointed out that the Hebrews did take something from the Egyptians, but it was not ideas they borrowed—only forms and practices. However, we may add that the very fact that the

Hebrews borrowed from the Egyptians forms and practices testifies to the influence of Egypt upon the Hebrews, though they did not take over religious ideas. We have an exact parallel in the Alexandrian period. The book contains also an appendix on the Date of the Exodus, in which the various views are discussed. The author is of the opinion that if the Hebrews had been fairly established in Palestine by the end of the eighteenth dynasty we would have found in the Hebrew records references to the great losses caused by the invasions of Seti I and Raamses II and Merneptah, and therefore thinks that the date of the Exodus might be placed at the end of the latter's reign. But the statements of Egyptian rulers are far from being exact, and a mere raid is frequently presented as an important campaign. The book is very interesting, as it contains many valuable suggestions and inferences which show historical acumen.

(13) A work of similar contents is Ch. L. Bedale's book, *The Old Testament and Archaeology*, the aim of which is to give examples, by selecting some of the most important discoveries, of the way in which our knowledge of the political, social, and religious life of Israel has been increased. The book consists of four chapters. Chapter I, entitled Israel's Predecessors and Neighbours, describes the palaeolithic and neolithic periods, the aborigines, and the coming of the Semites and Hittites. Chapter II, entitled the Civilization of Canaan, deals with the material and religious elements. Of interest is the following remark: 'It was inevitable that the Israelites should adopt the trades and occupations and many of the habits of the people among whom they dwelt. But the situation was one of considerable peril. The material and the religious elements of the Canaanite civilization was so closely bound together that the adoption of one was almost certain to involve the adoption of the other, and to a very large extent, in the case of the majority of the Israelites, that is what actually happened.' Chapter III

(13) *The Old Testament and Archaeology*. By CHARLES L. BEDALE, M.A. (*Manuals for Christian Thinkers*). London: CHARLES H. KELLY. pp. 134.

gives an outline of the history of Israel in the light of the monuments, from Solomon to the fall of Jerusalem. Of special value is Chapter IV, entitled Israel's Triumph. It deals with the question how Israel's importance is to be explained. Notwithstanding the close of its career as an independent state Israel triumphed. Our wonder at this phenomenon grows even greater as we recognize her comparative poverty and failure in other respects. Some, finding the marvel too great for their acceptance, have maintained that Israel's religion, like its material culture, was borrowed, and on the ground that there are numerous points of contact between the religious beliefs and practices of Babylonia and Israel, have pointed to Babylonia as its home. The author proceeds to show the superiority of Israel's religion to that of Babylonia by the incantation texts, the creation and deluge stories. It is the abiding glory of Israel of having produced a religious literature surpassing not only the Babylonian, but also that of every other nation in the world.

The book is a very useful archaeological manual, as it presents within a narrow compass the archaeological knowledge absolutely necessary for the study of the Old Testament. The information is accurate, the inferences are reasonable, and show an unbiassed judgement, the style is crisp, clear, and attractive. Its tendency is on the whole conservative, without insisting in each point upon the traditional view. The chronology is correct with the exception of two dates. Lugal-zaggisi is rightly placed 2800, while Sargon I, who overthrew the latter, is dated 150 years later, about 2650. Hammurabi is dated 1958-1916, which is quite impossible.

(14) Similar, but more comprehensive, is W. Cruickshank's book, *The Bible in the Light of Antiquity*. The modest appearance of this small volume does not suggest its high value, for it is actually an excellent handbook of Biblical archaeology, and pre-

(14) *The Bible in the Light of Antiquity*. A Handbook of Biblical Archaeology by Rev. WILLIAM CRUICKSHANK, B.D., Kineff (*Guild Text-books*). London: A. and C. BLACK; Edinburgh: R. and R. CLARK, LTD., 1913. pp. viii + 146.

sents an exact and succinct account of the whole mass of archaeological material for the proper understanding of the Bible in the present state of our knowledge. The work, as the author says, is merely intended as a review of the results of explorations and excavations in Bible lands, and as this work is being continued, there can be no finality in a book which professes to deal with the results of these operations. He points out that discoveries as sensational as any hitherto made may at any time be announced from some place in the East, and this may lead to modification or abandonment of views presently held; for this reason one must exercise caution in expressing opinions. The author is not concerned with the prehistoric remains of Palestine, but confines his attention to the period that coincides with Biblical and especially Old Testament times. While interested in every discovery from any quarter in the East that casts light upon the Bible, he chiefly deals with the discoveries relating to the land with which the latter is most clearly connected.

The book consists of five sections divided into twenty-seven chapters. Section I describes the general features of Palestine, the excavations conducted there, its inhabitants, and the powers with which it came in contact. Section II is entitled *Society*, and deals with the position of the king, with war, law, family commerce, money, weights and measures. Section III shows the condition of agriculture, arts and crafts, and gives a description of housing, food, dress and ornaments, games and amusements. The two last sections, which deal with education, language and literature, traditions, beliefs, and doctrines, and many other subjects, are of special interest. There are constant references to Biblical passages on which the subjects discussed have some bearing. A pleasing feature of this work which greatly facilitates its use as a book of reference is that the subjects under discussion are printed in large type, and so are the headings of each paragraph. There is no need to discuss the views presented, as they contain very little to which one may take exception.

(15) While the information on the excavations of Palestine given in the last two volumes is quite sufficient for the Bible student, those desirous of being made thoroughly acquainted with this subject will do well to consult P. S. P. Handcock's book, *The Archaeology of the Holy Land*, the object of which is to give an account of the arts, crafts, manners, and customs of the inhabitants of Palestine from the earliest times down to the Roman period. It is a highly scientific work based for the most part on Macalister's *Excavations of Gezer*, but the treatment on the whole is rather dry, and numerous facts dwelt on are of interest for the archaeologist rather than the Bible student. It would make more congenial reading if the subject-matter were presented throughout in the light of the Scriptures, as is done here and there, and especially in the last chapter. But the author himself does not believe that the results of these excavations are of immense value for Biblical studies, as he observes: 'On the whole, archaeology throws little new light on the religious practices and customs which obtained in Palestine during the pre-Christian Semitic periods. The excavations have indeed filled in some of the details and intensified the colours, but they have not made any material alteration in the picture which we already had. The prevalence of foreign influence—Egyptian, Mycenaean, Babylonian, Assyrian, and Greek—could be readily inferred from the Biblical records, but the precise effect of these exotic influences on the religion of the country is still largely a matter of speculation' (p. 372 f.). However, the very fact that the Biblical records are being confirmed by the archaeological remains is a matter of no small importance for the question whether the Biblical authors are reliable, whose testimony we may trust also on matters not connected with archaeology. But on one point the author claims that a Biblical statement is disproved by archaeology: 'None of the fortification works at Jericho shows any sign of having been destroyed to the extent that a reader of

(15) *The Archaeology of the Holy Land*. By P. S. P. HANDCOCK, M.A. With coloured frontispiece, 25 plates, 109 figures in text, and 2 folding plans. New York: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY, 1916. pp. 383.

Joshua 6 would naturally suppose' (p. 101). However, the whole lengthy discussion of Sellin's view that the wall excavated is of Israelite origin is gratuitous. The author observes : 'No reasonable person who is not blinded by prejudice or biassed by a desire to bolster up an unsupportable theory can have any doubt as to the meaning of Joshua 6. 20. The writer obviously meant that as the result of the blowing of the trumpets and the processional march of the priests, the wall of the city collapsed *as a whole*, the fall being in the nature of a miracle' (p. 102). But if the latter was indeed the case, there was no need for encompassing the city seven days in succession, and on the seventh day seven times. These long and weary religious ceremonies could not have been without a reason. Furthermore, to any reasonable Bible student it must be clear that in the Biblical conception miracles happen only when human agency is at the end of its power ; yet the Biblical author does not indicate in the least that the Israelites had made any effort to conquer the city in a natural way. Finally, if Jericho fell by a miracle, there was no need for the Israelites to fight at all. Therefore we may just as emphatically state that no reasonable person, who understands the Biblical mode of thought and expression, can have any doubt as to the meaning of the encompassing the city for many and many times, that it was in the nature of a stratagem by which the vigilance of the defenders was naturally relaxed—any modern garrison might be deceived in the same way. Seeing the besiegers day after day performing these religious ceremonies instead of attacking the city, the defenders naturally made fun of these proceedings and became tired of watching them. Thus we may well imagine that just at a moment when some parts of the wall were free from defenders, the Israelites rushed amid shouting to the wall and effected several breaches in it. We may rest assured that the besiegers did not merely 'shout', but attacked the wall at the same time. It is very likely that the record of the conquest of Jericho was taken from the Book of *Jashar*, just as that of the battle against the five kings (Joshua 10), and records of this kind, while substantially true, ought not to be taken literally.

The book consists of nine chapters. After an introductory chapter on the pre-Semitic, the various Semitic and the Hellenistic periods, there follow descriptions of the caves and rock-cuttings of the Troglodytes (II), the Architecture (III), Flint, Bone, Ivory, and Stone (IV), Metallurgy (V), Pottery (VI), Terra-cotta (VII), Burial Customs (VIII), and Worship and Places of Worship (IX). Of general interest are the last two chapters which contain many references to Biblical customs. Peculiar is the author's view that the pig was not regarded as an unclean animal. He observes: 'In spite of the abhorrence with which that animal was subsequently regarded, it was sometimes used as a sacrificial victim by the Semites (cf. Isa. 65. 4; 66. 17). This practice hardly seems reconcilable with the prevalent view that it was an unclean animal' (p. 361). But Isaiah's very words to which the author refers: 'which eat swine's flesh, and broth of abomination is in their vessels'; 'eating swine's flesh, and the abomination, and the mouse', leave no room for doubt that the pig, like the mouse, was regarded by the Israelites as an unclean animal, and that this conception is not due to a later 'authoritative priesthood', which the author so unjustly arraigns. As a matter of fact, the pig was from the earliest period considered unclean among the Semites and the Egyptians. It is noteworthy that in the Carthaginian laws of sacrifices the pig does not occur as a sacrificial animal, while the sacrifices mentioned are on the whole identical with those of the Hebrews.

(16) Comprehensive beyond comparison with the archaeological volumes hitherto reviewed and of quite a different character in the presentation and treatment of the archaeological material is George A. Barton's book, *Archaeology and the Bible*. There can be no difference of opinion that this book is in every respect, in its form of presentation, its contents, accuracy, and fullness, a most brilliant work. Here for once, as far as we

(16) *Archaeology and the Bible*. By GEORGE A. BARTON, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of Biblical Literature and Semitic Languages in Bryn Mawr College (*Green Find Book*, No. 17). Philadelphia: AMERICAN SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION, 1916. pp. xiii + 461, 9 maps, and 302 illustrations.

can see, we have a Biblical archaeology, in which the material is presented in an impartial way, and the author does not intrude his own particular opinions upon the reader, but gives both the modern and conservative inferences, and maintains throughout a neutral attitude on controverted points. The need of such a work was long felt among students of the Bible. As far as the translations of the cuneiform texts are concerned, we have here first-hand information, as the texts have been on the whole freshly translated by the author especially for this work, and the author's name, well known as an eminent Assyriologist and authority on Sumerian, is a full guarantee for their accuracy. Though the work is especially written for the use of the pastor and Sunday-school teacher, the treatment is thoroughly free from any religious bias, and it ought to be consulted by religious teachers of any denomination. It is a standard work on Biblical archaeology, and will very likely maintain this prominent position for some years to come. Its object is to present the most valuable information of all sorts that excavation has brought to light, the wealth of illumination for Biblical study that exploration has produced, and an outline of the history of the exploration in the Bible lands sufficient to enable the reader to place each item in its proper perspective. No attempt has been made to treat subjects to which exploration has contributed no new knowledge.

The book consists of two parts. Part I, divided into fifteen chapters, treats of the Bible lands, their exploration, and the resultant light on Bible land history, and Part II, divided into twenty-seven chapters, presents translations of ancient documents which confirm or illuminate the Bible. In Part I, Chapters I–III deal concisely with the discoveries, archaeology, history, and civilization of Egypt, Babylonia, and Assyria, and the Hittites. A much more detailed treatment is given to Palestine, to which Chapters IV–XIV are devoted, which deal with its exploration, archaeological history, cities, roads and agriculture, pottery, utensils and personal ornaments, measures, weights and money, high places and temples, tombs, Jerusalem and the Decapolis (the ten cities in which Greek population was dominant and

which formed a federation). Chapter XV presents the discoveries in Asia Minor which throw light on the New Testament. In Part II the translations of ancient documents are arranged in the order of the Biblical books which they illuminate. Each translation is accompanied by a brief discussion in which its chief bearing on the Bible is pointed out. In these discussions the author maintains a neutral attitude, and in each case reports impartially the principal inferences drawn by the most important group of scholars, that the reader may know something of the latitude of opinion that prevails. He observes: 'The temptation is always strong to declare that the interpretation of an ancient record which accords with one's own view must be right. But unfortunately problems in ancient history that are thus dogmatically settled, do not remain settled. A deeper faith, confident in the final triumph of truth patiently awaits further light' (p. 233). It is sincerely to be regretted that this attitude is not shared by the largest and most influential part of the modern critics.

Of the second part, the first two chapters contain the two Babylonian accounts of Creation, which are compared with Gen. 1-2. The third discusses the Babylonian Sabbath. In the fourth, the legend of Adapa is compared with the Fall of Man. The fifth treats of the Hebrew and Babylonian antediluvian patriarchs. The attempt to prove that the names of the former are identical with those of the latter is decidedly forced and far-fetched. But there can be no doubt that the names of the Hebrew patriarchs are Babylonian, either Akkadian or Sumerian. An attempt to explain these names independently of those of the Babylonian antediluvian kings is not difficult. As for instance, the name of *Abel* might correspond to cuneiform *aplu*, 'son', which in Babylonia was evidently pronounced *ablu* (cf. Merodach-bat-adan, but Tiglath-pil-eser). The name *Cain*, who 'was a tiller of the ground', might be connected with Sumerian *gan*, 'field'. In *Seth* we may perhaps see Sumerian *shitim*, 'skilled workman'. *Enoch*, which is also the name of a city, might be a rendering of Sumerian *hen-uku*, 'abundance of the people'. *Methusael* of course corresponds to cuneiform *Mutu-sha-ilu*, 'the

man of God'. *Irād* might be identical with the city-name *Eridu*, 'the good city'. *Lamech* might possibly correspond to *Lam-ki* perhaps, 'the splendour of the place'. *Jared* might perhaps be the Hebraized cuneiform word *warad*, 'servant'.

Chapters VI–VII contain Babylonian accounts of the Deluge. We notice that Hilprecht's fragment of the Deluge story is not referred to. Chap. VIII contains an account of the origin of a city and the beginning of agriculture from a tablet written in Nippur before 2000, which Langdon published under the title, *The Sumerian Epic of Paradise, the Flood, and the Fall of Man*, Philadelphia, 1915. The author does not share Langdon's view that this text deals with those subjects. Chapter IX is entitled Abraham and Archaeology, and contains some contracts from Babylonia, in which an Abraham (*Abarama*) was one of the contracting parties, but this man was not the Biblical patriarch. In this connexion it is worth mentioning that while the name *Abarama* corresponds to Biblical *Abram*, Lutz, in his publication *Early Babylonian Letters*, New Haven, 1917, called attention to the name *A-ba-ra-ḥa-am* (No 15, 13), which perhaps corresponds to *Abraham*. This chapter contains also a discussion of Gen. 14. Chapter X deals with the archaeological material that has a bearing on the stories of Jacob and Joseph. Chapters XI–XII give the tale of Sinuhe, the legend of Sargon, and the inscription of Merneptah. Highly instructive is Chapter XIII, which presents the laws of Hammurabi and the Biblical parallels. The author goes decidedly too far in declaring that the laws of the Old Testament are in no essential way dependent upon the Babylonian laws. Jampel's opinion that the laws of the pre-Mosaic Hebrews were, as far as they could be applied to their circumstances, identical with those of the Code of Hammurabi, and that many of them were embodied in the Mosaic legislation, is certainly very reasonable, and in full accordance with the Biblical traditions. The author's opinion is more in accordance with that of S. A. Cook in his work, *The Laws of Moses and the Code of Hammurabi*, who attempts to show the originality of the Mosaic laws. But as Johns, in the following book reviewed, rightly

observes: 'For such critics it is vital to maintain the exclusion of external influence. There is no criterion of date for them if the orderly continuous evolution along well-known lines can be supposed to be overwhelmed by a catastrophic influence from without.'

Chapter XIV gives an alleged parallel to Leviticus, a Carthaginian law concerning sacrifices. The striking similarity of the latter to the former is significant, as it would show that a considerable number of the regulations of the ritual go back to an early period before the foundation of Carthage by the Phoenicians. Chapters XV-XVI contain Palestinian letters of the Amarna period, and the report of the Egyptian Wenamon who was sent to the Lebanon to fetch cedar woods. Chapter XVII, entitled *Archaeological Light on the Books of Kings*, gives among others the Egyptian list of the Asiatic cities conquered by Shishak, Assyrian references to Palestine, the Moabite and the Siloam inscriptions, and some Neo-Babylonian references. Chapter XVIII deals with the end of the Captivity, and gives inscriptions of Nabunaid and Cyrus which have a bearing on Biblical statements regarding Belshazzar, the Book of Daniel, and the return of the Jews.

Highly important is Chapter XIX, which discusses the Elephantine papyri. It is strange that the author in dealing with the problem of the origin of the Jewish colony in Egypt entirely ignores the account of Jeremiah concerning the immigration of the Judaeans into Egypt. The temple at Jeb may well have been built by these immigrants, of whom some may have entered as soldiers in the service of the Egyptian king. Further, the author omitted to mention the fact that there are indications that the Jewish colony at Jeb were not pure Jahveh-worshippers. From such a point of view the inferences would have been somewhat different. Chapters XX-XXIV present Babylonian poems of affliction, which show similarities to the Book of Job, psalms from Babylonia and Egypt, parallels to Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, Egyptian parallel to Canticles, and illustrations of passages in the Prophets. The three remaining chapters give reputed sayings of

Jesus found in Egypt, archaeological light on the enrolment of Quirinius, and on the Acts and Epistles. The 301 beautiful illustrations add to the value of this work.

Considering the author's liberal attitude toward all shades of opinion, we shall not enter into a discussion of the various inferences concerning Biblical subjects. We confine ourselves to a few points in the outline of the Babylonian history, as some of them have an important bearing on the Biblical accounts. We notice that the author unreservedly adopted Eduard Meyer's view that the Semites were the first to arrive in the Euphrates valley, which, however, has very little justification, and is scarcely in accord with Biblical tradition. The statement that after the fall of the First Dynasty of Babylon 'the Hittites appear to have ruled the country for a short time, when they were driven out by the Dynasty of the Sea-Lands, which so far we know controlled the country for the next hundred and fifty years' (p. 59), is not exact, as we have no evidence that Akkad was ever under the rule of the Second Dynasty. This view is scarcely more than an assumption based upon the opinion that Ea-gamil, the last king of this dynasty, was a contemporary of Kashtiliash, the third king of the Kassite dynasty. But there may have been another king bearing the same name, since among the Kassites, as among the Assyrians and others, we find various rulers bearing the same name. There indeed were two kings of the name Kashtiliash, and why not a third? In the Kassite dynastic list there is a lacuna of one hundred years at least that cannot be filled out by other sources, comprising it would seem the kings of the sixteenth century. Therefore, the Kassite king Kashtiliash, in whose time the Second Dynasty terminated, may belong to this period. This would well accord with Kugler's lowest date for the year of accession of Ammi-zaduga, the year 1857, as the date of the Second Dynasty, which was established in the twelfth year of Samsu-iluna, and lasted 368 years, would be 1942-1574. The acceptance of this date would solve two important problems in Babylonian history. Firstly, it would explain the absence of any archaeological evidence of the rule of the Second Dynasty

in Akkad. Secondly, it would show that the Kassites did not wait 150 years for the conquest of Babylonia, but entered into its possession a comparatively short time after the downfall of the Hammurabi Dynasty. It is highly probable, as generally suggested, that there were some relations between the Hittites who overran Babylonia and the Kassites who took possession of this country.

But of more importance is the bearing that this date would have upon Biblical chronology and incidentally upon Genesis 14. The incident narrated there could have occurred only before the thirty-first year of the reign of Hammurabi, and not later. Notwithstanding the difficulties pointed out by the author in the identification of Amraphel with Hammurabi, we must insist upon that all the circumstances of that incident point to the latter's reign. But according to the current date of that king, 2123-2081, in agreement with Kugler's second date for the accession-year of Ammi-zaduga, Abraham could not have been a contemporary of Hammurabi. The former, according to the Biblical chronology, entered Canaan 645 years before the Exodus. As to the latter assumption held by many conservative scholars that it occurred before the Amarna period, under the powerful Eighteenth Dynasty, it may be safely dismissed as out of consideration. The modern current view that the Israelites entered Canaan about 1200 would not be in accordance with the account of the Book of the Judges. It would be almost impossible to crowd all the events narrated there into the brief space of about 150 years, even if some of them occurred simultaneously. Naville's evidence for a later date and that the Pharaoh of the Oppression was Raamses II, in his work *The Store-City of Pithom*, is of little value, as we know that this vain king appropriated many earlier works, and the building of the cities Pithom and Raamses may have begun under the Eighteenth Dynasty and was finished under his reign. Therefore, the Exodus must have occurred in the interval between the Eighteenth and the Nineteenth Dynasties, thus about 1350. We need not dwell upon the conditions of this period, and how favourable they were for the liberation of the Hebrews. But we

may point out, by the way, that there is reason to assume that the Exodus was incidentally due to Amenophis IV, who suppressed not only all the cults of the Egyptians in establishing the monotheistic religion of the Solar Disc, but also that of the Hebrews, and the latter first clamoured merely for religious liberty. From the Biblical account we may indeed gather that the Exodus had its starting-point in a purely religious movement. Thus, in accepting Kugler's lowest date, the year of Hammurabi's accession would be 2000, and about the same time we may place Abraham's departure from Ur of the Chaldees.

(17) A work that deals with one of the most important phases of archaeology to which we have already referred in the former reviews, is C. H. W. Johns' book, *The Relations between the Laws of Babylonia and the Laws of the Hebrew Peoples*. In comparing the Code of Hammurabi with the Mosaic laws, the author takes the view that the former belongs to the same group of ancient legislation as the Hebrew, and that both are compromises between two distinct types of law, the one of primitive Semitic custom, and the other of a settled community. Both the Israelites and the West Semites, to whom Hammurabi belonged, previously obeyed primitive laws, and forming as they did the ruling races in Canaan and Babylonia, clung with Oriental conservatism to their primitive customs. But the West Semites found in Babylonia the laws of a settled community, which may have been evolved through long ages. Similarly, in Canaan the Israelites found a long-settled people in possession who were governed by laws similar to those of the settled Babylonians. Much that is common to the laws of the two settled communities may have arisen independently. As the Israelites became a settled population many of their nomad customs must have become inappropriate, and they might have taken over the laws of the Canaanites, as far as they were innocent, or not too obnoxious to Hebrew

(17) *The Relations between the Laws of Babylonia and the Laws of the Hebrew Peoples*. By the Rev. C. H. W. JOHNS, M.A., Litt.D., Master of St. Catharine's College, Cambridge. *The Schweich Lectures, 1912* (*The British Academy*). London: HUMPHREY MILFORD, 1914. pp. xv + 96.

prejudices. Thus the common material of the two Codes may be due to one of the two common sources, primitive Semitic law and the law of settled communities. The author thus thinks that both legislations are compromises between the two types of law, that they show different degrees of preponderance of one or the other type, and that the laws of Moses manifest an independent development strongly influenced by the Code of Hammurabi.

The book consists of three lectures delivered before the British Academy. The first deals with the external features of the Code of Hammurabi, dwelling chiefly on those that are useful for a comparison with the Israelite legislation, and describes the discovery of the Code, its form and script and the fragments of several copies, the state of society and its laws. The author points out that the state of society bears surprising likenesses to that of Europe in the Middle Ages. The law itself is no less advanced. Justice has replaced vengeance. Self-help is restrained, if not suppressed. There is full protection for the weak, the widows, and orphans. Women are placed in a position of freedom and independence of their husbands. Education was at such a high pitch that Hammurabi assumes that every injured person would come and read for himself the laws that applied to his own case, or at least find a neighbour who could do so. In many respects we find the most extraordinary medley of ancient and modern laws. The extraordinary confidence in the power of the oath to secure truthful witness is remarkable. The tenure of a Babylonian retained of the king reveals strange likenesses to the feudal system. We have here the institution of the will, the invention of which has been usually ascribed to the Romans.

The second lecture points out the types of likeness between the Babylonian and Hebrew laws, and the associated contrasts. Notable is the author's reference to the Rabbinical interpretations: 'We are sometimes assured that the discussions of the Jewish Rabbis embody all the results of modern criticism. Certainly they do contain an amount of material for the elucidation of the Mosaic laws which is almost bewildering in extent. . . .

In fact it seems to be the case that the later Jewish interpretation of the Mosaic law so closely follows Babylonian law that it may be regarded as no less a commentary on that legislation. Our task would soon be at an end if we could be sure that this traditional view was not strongly influenced by the Jewish exile, but really represented what the old Jewish law was intended to be. . . . Very little more need be said than that the Jews with their wonderful adaptability to the customs of the land of their adoption which has always rendered them the best of citizens, readily assimilated all that was good in Babylonia while preserving also the best things in their ancient law and jealously guarding whatever was sacred by its religious value' (p. 15 f.). The author's arguments are evidently directed against views as advanced by Jampel in his work reviewed above (8).

Of still more interest are the author's views of modern scholarship, to which we have already repeatedly referred: 'Modern scholarship has succeeded in fixing and separating out of the Books of Moses a number of different sources or documents. . . . We must accept these results, so far as we can get a notion of them, and refer to the separate codes rather than to a single body of laws known as those of Moses. No one can venture to dispute these decisions on pain of being reckoned reactionary and obscurantist. These scholars hold the seat of authority, and it would be rash presumption to question their ruling. Nor have I any wish to do this. Yet it may be hoped that they will pardon a sigh of regret on our part that we are now unable to compare the Mosaic law as a whole with the Code of Hammurabi. It would be so much easier for the lecturer, and the indebtedness of Moses to Hammurabi so much more convincing to you. Sadly as many have lamented the tearing of the great law-book into pieces as rendering it a mere thing of patches and shreds, they may take comfort that its present condition renders it much harder to recognize the characteristic texture of the Babylonish garment' (p. 16).

But while the author is far from being convinced of the modern views, though granting for purposes of comparison that

the Book of the Covenant is the sole relic of the earliest Hebrew legislation and that the rest may be regarded as later development, he cannot accept the traditional view either, as here tradition itself imports many difficulties. If we set Moses at his old place in history and accept the traditional synchronism of Abraham and Amraphel, and the modern identification of the latter with Hammurabi, the Hammurabi Code is thus as much older than the Mosaic law as Abraham is before Moses. On the authority of Moses himself that means 340 years. But the Babylonians reckoned 550 years from the death of Hammurabi to the death of Kadashman-Elil, a contemporary of Amenophis while that king was still sovereign of Palestine and therefore before Moses. The author goes on to attack the identification of Amraphel with Hammurabi, and thereby incidentally the authenticity of Gen. 14, though he asserts: 'This fact neither confirms nor contradicts the Hebrew narrative' (pp. 17-20).

However, on these points the author is utterly wrong. According to the Hebrew version—not LXX—we find 650 years at least between the departure of Abraham from Ur and the Exodus. If the latter took place shortly after the death of Amenophis IV, as the present writer suggested above in his review of Barton's book (16), the date of Abraham would be in full agreement with that given by the author to Hammurabi. Further, the author is of course wrong in denying that Biblical Shinear is the name of Babylonia, though originally it may have designated only the southern part Shumer. We cannot expect the Biblical writer to call Amraphel king of Babel or Akkad, as to him these were the names of cities situated in the land of Shinear. As to the corruption of the names mentioned in Gen. 14, there is nothing strange about it. We must bear in mind that the Biblical writings have undergone frequent transliterations from the Phoenician into the Aramaic characters of the fifth century and from the latter into other modifications of this script, and that the copyists in all likelihood had not the slightest idea of the meaning of those names which thus may have become easily corrupted. As for instance, in the Aramaic characters prevailing in the fifth century

in Egypt, the distinction between *waw* and *lamed* is frequently very slight, it is thus the original name *Amrapū* may have become *Amrapel*. Moreover, we must remember that those names may have become corrupt long before the narrative of Gen. 14 was committed to writing, as corruptions of foreign names occur very frequently. We have only to think of the name *Shulmanu-asharid* which became Shalmaneser, or *Sharru-kēnu* = Sargōn, *Ashurbani-pal* = Osnappar, *Nabu-kudurri-uṣur* = Hebraized Nebuchadnezzar, of the Greek transliterations of the names of the Persian kings, none of which is correct, and of the various writings of these names in cuneiform. Further, if the name generally read Arad-Sin was pronounced *Eri-Aku* = Arioch, the name Rim-Sin may have been pronounced *Riw-Aku*, which might likewise correspond to *Arioch*. The people in the Westland may not have had the least idea of the fact that the king Eri-Aku was succeeded by his young brother who bore a similar name. But it seems that both Arad-Sin and Rim-Sin were merely the nominal rulers of Larsa, while the real sovereign was their father, Kudur-mabug.

The author's further question: 'At what period of Hammurabi's reign was an alliance with his life-long enemy Rim-Sin likely or even possible?' (p. 19), rests on the current misconception of the Babylonian history of that period. A thorough investigation would show that Sin-muballit, the father of Hammurabi, was decidedly defeated by Kudur-mabug, Rim-Sin's father and guardian, in the last year of his reign, and may have lost his life on the battle-field. He evidently came to the assistance of Isin, whose king Damikilishu may have been his suzerain. Isin was conquered, and Hammurabi on his accession was forced to recognize the suzerainty of Kudur-mabug, who on his part may have been the vassal of the overlord of Elam, and it was only after the death of the former that Hammurabi could make himself independent and encroach upon the dominion of Rim-Sin. The 30 years of the Isin era correspond to the first 30 years of Hammurabi's reign. His dominion must have been rather insignificant in his twenty-third year, as seen from

the Sippar building inscription, published by A. Ungnad in his publication *Babylonian Letters of the Hammurabi Period* (BE.VII), Philadelphia, 1915, p. 30f. The author's final question: 'When did either make an expedition to the West under the suzerainty of Elam?' is no less a misconception. We know that Hammurabi was king of Amurru, as he styled himself, and it is generally admitted that his empire included Syria and Palestine, and yet we may ask: when did Hammurabi undertake an expedition to the West? As to the rule of Elam over the West, the present writer has some suspicion that Rim-Anum may ultimately prove to be identical with the Biblical Kedorlaomer. Rim-Anum may have been the adopted Babylonian name of this Elamitic king and a translation of his Elamitic name.

The essential importance of this work lies in the third lecture, which discusses the extent of dependence of the Mosaic laws upon that of Hammurabi. There is no need to enter into a discussion of the author's views, which are so obvious as to be almost beyond any doubt. We can only express our regret that the author submits under protest to the critical views and treats the Mosaic laws from that point of view. Sane scholarship is deeply indebted to the eminent scholar for this splendid monograph that must be read to be fully appreciated. The book contains also an immensely valuable survey of the bibliography of the literature relating to the Code of Hammurabi.

(18) Another work dealing with Israel's laws as well as those of other Semites from a social anthropological aspect is H. Schaeffer's book, *The Social Legislation of the Primitive Semites*. This is a notable contribution to Semitic studies, as it contains a great amount of information which is investigated and presented in a scholarly way, the subject-matter is full of interest, the style is clear, and it makes pleasant reading. But we regret to find that its treatment is predominated by views of the most advanced critics which as a rule are almost indiscriminately accepted. It

(18) *The Social Legislation of the Primitive Semites*. By HENRY SCHAEFFER, Ph.D. New Haven: YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS. London: HUMPHREY MILFORD, 1915. pp. xiv + 245.

contains fourteen chapters which deal with Matriarchy (I), Patriarchy (II), Agnation (III), Next-of-kin (IV), Slavery (V), Interest (VI), Pledges and Security (VII), the Social Problem as viewed by the Prophets (VIII), Poor Laws (IX), Sabbatical Year (X), the Year of Jubilee (XI), Ezekiel's Plan of Allotment (XII), Taxation and Tribute (XIII), and the Development of Individual Land-ownership in Israel (XIV).

In Chapter I the author discusses the evidence for the existence of matriarchy among the early Hebrews. The evidence from female tribal names as Hagar and Keturah, Leah and Rachel, Bilhah and Zilpah is rather naïve, as it means the basing of one hypothesis upon another. The ceremony of adoption by which Bilhah's children are acknowledged by Rachel as her own is no indication of the presence of matriarchy, as Bilhah was Rachel's hand-maid and her children rightly belong to the mistress. Laban's insistence upon his right to retain the wives and the children of Jacob as his own property does not remain unintelligible, even if we do not assume a type of *beena* marriage, of which this is supposed to be a remnant. Laban's claim must be viewed in the light of the laws relating to slavery in the so-called Book of the Covenant (Exod. 21. 2-4), which, on the whole, is evidently pre-Mosaic, as Johns and Jampel and others contend. Jacob sold himself twice to Laban, and the latter claimed that he gave his daughters as wives to his slave, and thus the wives and children rightly belong to him, if the slave goes out after his time of servitude expired, in accordance with the common Semitic law, while Jacob claimed, 'I served thee fourteen years for thy daughters' (31. 41), and that he married as a free man. Thus Laban's claim was merely a legal fiction. While, however, the evidence presented 'is in the main rather of a suggestive than convincing character', as the author admits, he might have mentioned a fact which is rather convincing. The words of Abraham to Abimelech: 'And yet indeed she is my sister; she is the daughter of my father, but not the daughter of my mother; and she became my wife' (Gen. 20. 12), leave scarcely any room for doubt that the real kinship was only through the mother.

Abraham could not have married Sarah if she had been the daughter of his mother, as the marriage of a real sister was not permitted among the Semites. The permission to marry a sister from the father's side may have been a survival from the period of matriarchy. This practice seems to have been so common that it could not be abolished by the Mosaic legislation, as seen from the story of Amnon and Tamar (2 Sam. 13. 13), unless we hold that the prohibition of Lev. 18. 9 dates from a later period, or assume with the Talmud that Tamar was David's step-daughter.

In Chapter II the author advances reasons that brought about the change from matriarchy to patriarchy. We do not believe in any of the views suggested. The problem is more simple than the author imagines. The system of matriarchy originally was due to the low moral standard of primitive peoples. No husband could with any probability claim the children of his wife as his own. Characteristic in this connexion is the Talmudic question: 'How can a man be executed for striking his father, since we have no guarantee that the culprit was the latter's son?' (*Hulin* 11^b). If we may believe the testimony of the Rabbis of the third century C.E., who were well acquainted with the Arabians and had no special reasons for any animosity against them, we may assume that the moral standard of the latter in the pre-Mohammedan period was decidedly low. The opinion of the Rabbis concerning the morality of the Arabians is illustrated in the following saying: 'Before giving the Law to Israel, God made attempts to give it to any of the other nations, but all of them declined as each found faults with some of its provisions. He went at least to the Ishmaelites. But they asked: What is written there? and the answer was: Thou shalt not commit adultery. Then they replied we have no use for this Law' (*Siphre*). The system of patriarchy was a natural consequence of a higher standard of morality. Hence it is quite in order that we should not find in the Code of Hammurabi any allusion to matriarchy.

Concerning the levirate marriage, discussed in Chapter III, the author ought to have shown more independence than to

repeat critical views which have not the least justification. As for instance, he observes: 'Leviticus seeks to destroy it altogether by forbidding marriages between persons closely related to each other. This of course precludes marriage with a brother's wife' (p. 62). But the author of P must certainly have known D, and the critics ought to have given him more credit for common sense than to believe that he plainly contradicted the legislation of the latter. The law of Leviticus of course refers to general cases when the brother left children and no levirate is necessary. The law of levirate is based upon that of Leviticus and forms an exceptional case when the brother dies childless. But it is more noteworthy that the Jewish practice of levirate does not quite conform to the law of Deuteronomy. The latter decrees that levirate takes place if the deceased brother leaves no male issue, while in the practice no levirate is permissible if there is female issue. But the Deuteronomical law, which is pre-Mosaic, is based upon the principle that only males can inherit. Since, however, the latter law was repealed, and women in default of male issue are recognized as heirs, it is plain that concerning levirate no distinction should be made between male and female issues.

In Chapter X, the author's remark: 'It is taken for granted that the year begins in the spring, and not in the fall, as in the pre-exilic period' (p. 162), is incorrect. There is not the least trace in the Old Testament that in pre-exilic times the year began in the fall, even if we assign with the critics all the Biblical dates reckoning from Nisan to post-exilic writers. In the pre-Mosaic period in Egypt the year evidently began in the fall, and this beginning of the year was preserved by oral tradition down to the present, as, notwithstanding Exod. 12. 1, the year begins in the fall with the month of Tishri. The Seleucid and the Ptolemaic periods may have largely contributed to the preservation of this non-Biblical reckoning. Another remark in Chapter XII: 'The distinction drawn by Ezekiel between priests and Levites was wholly unknown to Deuteronomy' (p. 201), is wrong. In the latter the priests are called Levites, but the Levites are nowhere

called priests (cf. 12. 12, 18, 19 ; 14. 27, 29 ; 15. 11, 13 ; 18. 6-9 ; 26. 11, 12, 13) just as every Pennsylvanian is an American, but not every American is a Pennsylvanian.

(19) Another archaeological monograph of importance for Hebrew and Semitic religious institutions which are considered from an anthropological point of view, and especially for the institution of the Sabbath, is H. Webster's book, *Rest Days*. The author takes the view that the great institutions of modern civilization have their roots in the beliefs and customs, and often in the superstitions, of savage and barbarian society, and that it is the task of social anthropology, by an impressive accumulation of evidence, to demonstrate the truth of this fact. Starting from this view, he makes a thorough inquiry into the rest days so commonly observed outside of the Semitic area in antiquity and later ages, which shed light on the Jewish Sabbath and the Christian Sunday, and on the assumed Babylonian prototype of these institutions. The custom of refraining from labour on certain occasions is not unknown to peoples in the lower stages of culture. A survey of the evidence indicates that such observances do not have a rationalistic basis, due to man's need of relaxation and idleness as a relief from daily toil, but have arisen chiefly, if not wholly, as pure superstitions, and are, in the last analysis, based primarily on fear. They find their clearest expression in the 'tabooes', or prohibitions, first noticed among the natives of the South Seas, but now known to exist in many other regions of the aboriginal world. A comparative study of the taboos indicates that originally things or persons were tabooed because they were considered dangerous, mysterious, abnormal, and uncanny, but the fact must be recognized that the majority of taboos are now supported by animistic beliefs of a much more precise character.

The book is divided into nine chapters, the first four of which deal with tabooed days at critical epochs, after a death and on

(19) *Rest Days. A Study in Early Law and Morality.* By HUTTON WEBSTER, Ph.D., Professor of Social Anthropology in the University of Nebraska. New York: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY, 1916. pp. xiv + 325.

related occasions, holy days, and market days. To indicate the numerous points of high interest in the material presented would lead us out of the way of Semitic archaeology, as for the most part they have merely an incidental bearing on Biblical or Semitic subjects. But there are also references to the latter. Noteworthy is the following remark: 'The Day of Atonement has been usually considered a very late institution, unknown in the time of Zachariah and even in the age of Nehemiah not employed for the special purpose of a national humiliation. What seems more probable is that the Day of Atonement was taken over and adopted into the Priestly Code of post-exilic Judaism from a popular and primitive sin-riddance, doubtless of high antiquity' (p. 82). Neither the critics nor the author seem to know that there is unimpeachable evidence that the Day of Atonement, notwithstanding the fast enjoined by the Law, was never observed as a day of national humiliation, and therefore could not have been mentioned by Zachariah among the fast-days nor could have been employed by Nehemiah for this special purpose. We have for this contention the good authority of Rabban Simeon, son of Gamaliel, who says: 'There never were Good Days in Israel like the fifteenth of Ab and the Day of Atonement, in which the daughters of Israel went out . . . and danced in the vineyards; and what did they say?: Youth, lift up thine eyes, and look whom thou art choosing for thyself, &c., &c.' (Taanith 26 b). The Day of Atonement is indeed still considered as a festival, in the ritual and in the practice. Just like any other festival, if it occurs within days of mourning, they need not be further observed after this festival. The author's further remark that this day 'appears to have marked, originally, the beginning of the new year', is likewise totally wrong. The reference to Ezek. 40. 1 shows that the author repeated the current misinterpretation of that passage. But a survey of the dates in this book leaves not the least room for doubt that *Rosh Hashanah* mentioned there is the designation of the first month Nisan, in accordance with Exod. 12. 2. That the tenth day of this month was of some special importance and therefore especially suitable for Divine inspiration

is seen in the same chapter, verse 3. Besides, the tenth day of this month is no exception, as all the visions of Ezekiel occurred either on the first, fifth, tenth, or fifteenth of the months. We may well imagine that we have here sacred numbers. Finally, the author's statement that New Year's Day 'was also a *shabbath shabbāthōn*', is obviously an oversight, as it is merely called *shabbathon*. Only Sabbath and the Day of Atonement are designated *shabbath shabbathon*, on which complete rest is enjoined, not, however, the New Year's Day, on which the preparation of food is permitted.

Chapters V-IX deal with lunar superstitions and festivals, lunar calendars and the week, the Babylonian 'evil days', and the *Shabbatum*, the Hebrew Sabbath, and unlucky days. To the mass of evidence presented by the author, that the waxing moon was commonly regarded as favourable and the waning moon as unfavourable for the transactions of business of various sorts, we may add the fact that according to the *Shulḥan Arukh* no marriages are to be performed at the time when the moon is on the wane. But this prohibition is in many countries disregarded. The statement, given on the authority of J. Buxtorf, that 'among the Jews there were formerly many who abstained from food on the day of an eclipse of the moon, which they regarded as evil' (p. 135), is hardly correct, as the *Shulḥan Arukh* knows nothing about it. But it is true that the eclipse of the moon was regarded as an evil portent for Israel according to the Talmud: 'The eclipse of the sun is an evil portent to the gentiles, and the eclipse of the moon is an evil portent to Israel; for the former reckon by the sun and the latter by the moon' (Succah 29^a).

To the many solemn rites among various nations in connexion with the disappearance of the moon, which by the Babylonians was called 'day of sorrow', the author might have added the Jewish custom still observed by many pious Jews to fast on the day before the re-appearance of the moon, which as fast-day is called *Yōn: Kippūr Kāḏōn*, 'Little Day of Atonement'. The author obviously never heard of the general Jewish custom to recite prayers in the presence of the new moon, as a rule outside

of the synagogue, in the evenings between the seventh and fifteenth of the month, the performance of which is called 'the Sanctification of the Moon'. The knowledge of this fact has an important bearing on the problems discussed by the author.

In the treatment of the Babylonian and Hebrew sabbaths, the main object of the author is to prove that among both the Hebrews and the Babylonians the term *shabbath* was the technical expression for the fifteenth day as the time of the full moon. But, though holding that the Hebrew *shabbath* originally designated the full-moon day, he objects to the opinion that until the age of Ezekiel the Hebrews employed no weeks at all, and that continuous seven-days' weeks were introduced largely through Ezekiel's influence in post-exilic times, and hence that the sabbath as the last day of the periodic week was a post-exilic institution. He insists that the Hebrews employed seven-days' weeks perhaps several centuries preceding the exile; weeks, that is, which ended with special observances on the seventh day, but none the less tied to the moon's course. The change from such cycles to those unconnected with the lunation would not have involved so abrupt and sudden a departure from the previous system of time-reckoning as that from a bi-partite division of the lunar month to a week that ran continuously through the months and the years, as formerly held by scholars.

This book is certainly an excellent work, though there are points enough which provoke dissent. The subjects discussed are throughout highly interesting, their treatment is lucid, methodical, and could not be better, and it contains a vast amount of scholarship of diverse character. In the treatment of Biblical subjects the author's course might have been more smooth and his conclusions less forced if he had not been so exceedingly apprehensive lest his views might come into collision with the results of modern criticism. It is scarcely possible to maintain that the observances of sabbath and other Hebrew festivals have their roots in hoary antiquity and nevertheless still adhere to the opinion that they were post-exilic institutions. Whatever the meaning of Babylonian *shabātu* may be, that of this Hebrew

root 'to rest' is beyond any doubt. Then any day on which there is a cessation of labour may be called *shabbath*. Thus there is no reason to assert that the term *shabbath* was a special designation of the full-moon day. Jastrow's opinion, on which the author largely based his contention, that 'the morrow after the sabbath' (Lev. 23. 15) is here used not in its later sense of a seventh day of rest, but as a survival of the designation of the sabbath as the full-moon day, has scarcely any justification, as the identical passage distinctly states: 'Seven sabbaths shall be complete; even unto the morrow of the seventh sabbath shall ye number fifty days'. If the term *shabbath* designates only the full-moon day, how could it be applied to every seventh day on which the moon was not full? That the month itself was called after the new moon is no analogy to the latter case, as each period in which the moon is renewed may be called *Hôdesh*. If we disregard the view that Gen. 1 is post-exilic, there is no vestige of proof that the periodic week is not Mosaic or even pre-Mosaic, though originally it may have been connected with the lunation, as among the Babylonians.

Considering that the author especially refers to the Rabbinical works devoted to the provisions for sabbath observance, we were surprised to find a curious remark: 'The march of the Israelitish host around Jericho on seven successive days, one of which must have been the sabbath, if that institution as a weekly rest day was then known to them, would be a profanation of the sabbath according to later ideas. . . . But this account may contain a reminiscence of a period of Hebrew history when the week, either lunar or periodic, had not become established in Israel' (p. 256). We readily admit that the Rabbinic prohibition of blowing a trumpet on the sabbath, or the non-Pentateuchal prohibition of carrying a load on that day, were unknown to Joshua, and there was no other profanation of the sabbath, as far as we can see. The author ought not to have suggested so far-reaching a conclusion without consulting on those points the Rabbinic treatises which he referred to. Another remark that the length of a 'sabbath day's journey' had not been determined at the time of

Elisha or at that of the compiler of Kings (p. 251, 1) is gratuitous. The Rabbis themselves assert that it is not a Biblical provision.

(20) Another monograph which may be included among the works on Biblical archaeology is A. Smythe Palmer's book, *The Samson-Saga* (and its Place in Comparative Religion). The author's aim is to prove that the story which is told of Samson in the Book of Judges is to a large extent of legendary character, and contains many elements of popular tradition well known to the student of folk-lore. Though this fact had long been recognized by scholars, especially by Steintal, they laboured under the serious disability of having taken the subject in hand at a time when much of the Babylonian and other evidence placed at our disposal by modern research was not yet available. But the author with his greater advantages brings further light on the subject, and attempts to turn mere guess-work into something like certainty. However, in endeavouring to substantiate the views of former scholars, the author does not deny the historicity of Samson. He observes: 'There is no reason to doubt that an historical personage bearing this name actually lived, and fought, and rioted in the fields of Palestine in an early period, and enjoyed a widespread reputation as a popular hero among the Israelites. His fame, handed down by tradition, was much altered and magnified by accretions of a mythical character which got attached to his memory.'

For the explanation of the origin of this legend, the author advances the suggestion that among the very ancient folk-stories which the Israelites found current among the Canaanites was one concerning a famous wonder-working brigand of superhuman strength, who, as we now discover, was ultimately a personification of the mighty Sun himself, and that the peculiar characteristics of this solar hero in process of time seem to have coalesced and crystallized around the figure of the popular free-lance and champion of the Hebrews. His name Samson or *Shimshon*

(20) *The Samson-Saga* (and its Place in Comparative Religion). By A. SMYTHE PALMER, D.D. London: SIR ISAAC PITMAN & SONS, LTD., 1913. pp. xii + 267 and 3 illustrations.

naturally lends itself to the gathering around it of such mythical elements. The same thing has happened in various lands, and in various stages of civilization, down to quite recent times.

The author points out, as has been frequently done by other scholars, that the story of Samson is unique in the Bible record, standing out as a heterogeneous patch in the sober, prosaic history to which it has been very imperfectly assimilated. The Hebrews had a childhood, like every other people, which they outgrew, a period in their early history when they delighted in stories of adventure, and some traces of such early folk-tales have survived and been preserved in the literature of the Israelites. The story of Samson is a naturalized form on Canaanitish soil of an ancient solar legend which passed current in Babylonia many centuries earlier. Samson is the direct heir and representative among the Hebrews, as Heracles was among the Greeks, of the famous Sun-hero Gilgamesh. The author substantiates his suggestions by a vast number of illustrations out of the mythology, folk-lore, and poetry of the most diverse peoples, ancient and modern. These he regards as the staple of the book, which are adduced under the conviction that man everywhere and at all times formulates much the same ideas about the cosmic phenomena of nature, and often with the most striking resemblances of details.

The subject is treated in eighteen chapters. In the first chapter the author apologizes for venturing to handle the Scriptures in a spirit of critical investigation, and largely dwells on the strange episode of Samson. Chapter II shows the migration of folk-tales, the growth of legends around the figures of distinguished heroes, and solar ideas in mythologies. Chapter III describes popular heroes, solar names, and legendary elements. Chapters IV-VI deal with Samson's hair that represents the rays of the sun, his seven locks that represent the seven solar rays, and with the sun as a hero and judge. Chapters VII-XV illustrate Samson's actions as sun-hero, and XVI-XVIII discuss the meaning of *Manoah*, Samson's father, the mythological numbers in the story, and the figure of Gilgamesh. The book contains also an appendix, consisting of four chapters: Heroes Mytho-

logized, Heracles, the Greek Samson, Cuchulainn, the Celtic Samson, and Gautama and other sun-heroes.

Though the principal ideas of this book, the legendary character of Samson's personality and his career, and his prototype Gilgamesh, are by no means original, as the author himself repeatedly points out, we must nevertheless admit that the author has succeeded in producing a work that is full of absorbing interest from the beginning to the end. It is written in a popular vein, and the investigation of the material shows good sense and sound scholarship. The deductions are fairly reasonable, and there can scarcely be any weighty objections to the conclusions arrived at by the author. His assertion that 'even if some of the comparisons made should be only coincidences, the weight of the sum total of the converging and cumulative evidence will, I think, to a candid mind prove fairly conclusive', may be readily endorsed. If we see in Gilgamesh, who is doubtless an historical person, a sun-hero, the same may hold true of Samson. However, the very fact that the Gilgamesh legend represents a sun-myth is nothing but a mere assumption.

But whether the suggestions given in this book are true or not, there can be no doubt that the story of Samson, which is quite out of harmony with the Biblical conception of a hero and judge in Israel requires some explanation. Samson's conduct is more in accordance with that of a votary of Astarte than that of a Nazirite and a servant of JHVH. It has been rightly pointed out that his character as libertine is not in agreement with the annunciation of his birth by an angel from heaven. But man is determined by his environment. To understand Samson's character we must consider that of his people, the tribe of Dan, whose religious conceptions throughout the whole period of Israel's history were more Canaanite than Hebrew. Though nominally worshippers of JHVH, they were hardly better than idolators. The sanctuary of Dan may have differed very little from those of other Canaanite inhabitants. In its main features it may have been identical with the sanctuary of the former inhabitants of Laish, who seem to have been closely related to the Sidonians, which

may have been that of Astarte. Moreover, if we find under the corrupt kings of Judah the institution of *hierodouloi* (*Kadeshim* and *Kadeshōth*) connected with the Temple of Jerusalem, we may rest assured that such an institution was not wanting in the sanctuary of Dan. Among a people of such religious conceptions, fornication was far from being considered immoral. On the contrary, it was a holy rite, performed in the service of the goddess Astarte. Thus among his own people, Samson's licentious conduct was fully in harmony with his sacred character as a Nazirite. Considering the syncretic character of the JHVH religion of Samson's tribe, we well understand the belief that his birth was announced by an angel from heaven. From this point of view we need not accept Budde's view, as the author does, that the birth of Samson was the last part of the story to be written. The term *nazir*, 'consecrated', may actually be considered a synonym of *Kadesh*, which has the same meaning. The current translation of the latter term, 'Sodomite', is absolutely unwarranted. Both *Kadeshōth* and *Kadeshim* were dedicated to the service of Astarte, the former had intercourse with men and the latter with women. As a matter of fact, Astarte, as goddess of fertility, was not the goddess of unnatural lust. Thus Samson may have been a *Kadesh* of the Danite sanctuary, and his actions were in accordance with his priestly character. This story may have been written by the priests of this sanctuary, who of course considered his licentious conduct in the light of their religious conceptions. The Biblical compiler may not have understood them at all. These points have not been fully considered by any of the scholars who dealt with this subject.

(21) Of immense interest as an exhibition of ingenuity and originality is C. J. Ball's brief treatise, *Sumer and Shem*. Years ago when Jules Oppert and Joseph Halevy and their adherents had their famous quarrels over the existence of the Sumerians, they never imagined that there will come a time when the Semites

(21) *Sumer and Shem*. Some Philological Coincidences and Sequences. By C. J. BALL, D.Litt., Fellow of King's College, London (*The British Academy*). London: HUMPHREY MILFORD. pp. 35.

will not only be deprived of the honour of having been the inventors of the cuneiform script and language, but almost lose all credit for the development of their own various idioms. This is the intention of the author in the present thesis. After referring briefly to the indebtedness of the Semites to the culture of their Sumerian predecessors, the author observes: 'The evidence of language, however, though only partially available at present, seems to indicate certain affinities even more startling than any yet generally recognized, and to point to an intimate intercourse between the two races at a period long anterior to the fourth millennium B.C. Nay, if Semite and Sumerian were not originally one, as I sometimes incline to think, a comparison of the two languages, both from the material and the formal side, may suggest that as the Semitic nomads borrowed so many other elements of civilization from their predecessors in the plain of Shumer-Shinar, so they derived at least a very substantial portion of the stuff of articulate speech from the same mysterious source' (p. 1 f.). His principal aim is to demonstrate the fact that what we know of the Sumerian language throws considerable light upon the analysis and origin of Semitic roots, and even upon some of the principal formative elements of the Semitic verb and pronoun. He points to the biliteral stage which preceded that of trilateralism, and takes as examples the Semitic words for *father* and *mother*, which he derives from Sumerian ABBA and UM. He further demonstrates the affinity of Sumerian to Chinese, and other East Asiatic idioms. The latter precludes of course the assumption that the Sumerians borrowed these words from the Semites. A few examples will suffice to illustrate the author's method. Semitic *shakû*, 'to give drink', may be derived from Sum. NAG. *Shumu*, 'name', may be directly connected with NAM, SIM, 'to call'; *ēl*, god, may be compared with EL, 'bright'. The Semitic numerals III-IX are derived from Sumerian. The pronouns *shi*, *sha* correspond to Sum. NA, NE, NI. Interesting is the derivation of the Divine name JHVH: its etymon is to be recognized in the Sumerian I, IA, 'to be high, exalted', with addition of the Semitic case-ending *u*, thus *Jau*, 'the Lofty One'.

The author's theory is certainly original, but will scarcely find acceptance by Assyriologists. With the methods employed, the assumption of transition from *n* to a sibilant sound, throwing off initial and final consonant, the interchange of numerous consonants, and equation of many Sumerian values, there is nothing that an ingenious mind like that of the author could not prove. He evidently does not share the current conception that a large number of cuneiform values are directly derived from Semitic roots, as EL from *ellu*, 'bright, pure', RIK, from *rikkū*, 'incense', &c. According to his conception, the Semites on their entrance into the Euphrates Valley must have been in a very early stage of infancy, if they had to learn the expressions for *father* and *mother* from the Sumerians. But, as a matter of fact, the Sumerian general name for *father* is not AB but AD, and that for *mother* is not UM but DAGAL, if we may rely upon the Sumerian classic inscriptions. Sumerian UM = 'mother' is certainly a loan-word from the Semites, and perhaps also AB = *shibū*, 'old man'.

The relations between *Shumer* and *Shem* constitute indeed the fundamental problem of Hebrew Religion, History, and Archaeology, and its final solution will ultimately prove the downfall of the higher criticism, and vindicate the truth of the Hebrew traditions. Johns, in his book reviewed above (17), observes: 'But that a leader in the position to which tradition assigned Moses could perfectly well promulgate a code of laws as full and complete as the whole Mosaic law, even for a people in a primitive state of society in which *Israel is often supposed to have been at the Exodus is obvious*. He had only to avail himself of the knowledge of cuneiform, available at that time both in Canaan and in Egypt, and import copies of the Hammurabi Code from Babylonia, if they were not at hand where he then was. He could exercise his judgement what was suitable for his people, add what he chose, and reject what he disliked.' Certainly this is obvious, but we cannot expect that it should be perceived by those whose vision is obscured by the modern dogmatic bias.

JACOB HOSCHANDER.

Dropsie College.